DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 396 584 FL 023 960

AUTHOR	Bakmand, Bente, Ed.; And Others
TITLE	Papers in Language Policy from the Language Policy Conference (Roskilde, Denmark, January 29, 1996). ROLIG Papir No. 56.
INSTITUTION	Roskilde Univ. Center (Denmark).
REPORT NO	ISSN-0106-0821
PUB DATE	96
NOTE	64p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ROLIG, hus 03.2.4, RUC, Postbox 260, 4000 Roskilde, Denmark; e-mail: rolig@babel.ruc.dk; www: http://babel.ruc.dk[tilde]rolig/ (free).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingualism; Danish; Foreign Countries; *Language Attitudes; *Language Planning; Machine Translation; Multilingualism; *Public Opinion; *Public Policy; *Second Languages; Teacher Role; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS	Denmark; European Union; France; Germany; Great Britain

ABSTRACT

The papers included in this issue are from a conference on language policy. The papers are: "Why Promote European Multilingualism? French Experience" (Claude Truchot); "German Attitudes to European Language Policy" (Ulrich Ammon); "Minority Language Rights in Contemporary Europe" (Tove Skutnabb-Kangas); "Teacher Identities in Britain and Denmark in the Europeanisation Process" (Karen Risager); "Sub-Cultural Identities" English-Danish Grassroots Bilingualism" (Bent Preisler); "Danish Scholars and Languages of Scientific Communication" (Robert Phillipson, Kangas); "EU and Danish Support for Linguistic Engineering and Computerised Translation in a 'Small' European Language: Results and Implications for the Relationship between Danish and More Widely Used Languages" (Bente Maegaard); "EU-Supported Studies of Danish Perceptions of the Need for Language Policies in the Business Community" (Annelise Grinsted). Some points from the concluding discussion session are reported by Bente Bakmand, Phillipson, and Skutnabb-Kangas. Excerpts from a White Paper on education and training by the Commission of the European Communities is appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ISSN 0106-0821

ED 396 581

ROLIG papir

Bente Bakmand,
Robert Phillipson
and Tove
Skutnabb-Kangas,
eds.

Papers in
Language Policy

56 96

Roskilde UniversitetsCenter
Lingvistgruppen

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Hartmut Haberland
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL023960

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ISSN 0106-0821

ROLIG-papir 56
Roskilde Universitetscenter
Lingvistgruppen

Bente Bakmand, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, eds.
Papers in Language Policy

Papers from the Language Policy Conference, Roskilde, January 29, 1996

ROLIG-papir is a series of working papers written by members of ROLIG, the linguistic circle of Roskilde University Center, and others. Readers are invited to comment on or criticize the papers. For ordering information, see the back of this page.

Roskilde Universitetscenter
April 1996

ROLIG papers are distributed free of charge to any private person or institution on our mailing list. Write to: ROLIG, hus 03.2.4, Roskilde University Center, P.O.Box 260, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark
e-mail: rolig@babel.ruc.dk
WWW: http://babel.ruc.dk/~rolig/
FAX: (+45) 46 75 44 10
In the USA, some ROLIG-papers are available on microfiche/paper from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, c/o CAL, 1118 22nd Stret, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20067

ROLIG-papirerne bliver sendt gratis til alle der står i vores adressekartotek.
ROLIGs adresse er: ROLIG, hus 03.2.4, RUC, Postbox 260, 4000 Roskilde
elektronisk post: rolig@babel.ruc.dk
WWW: http://babel.ruc.dk/~rolig/
FAX: 46 75 44 10

Bente Bakmand, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds.)
Papers in Language Policy
Papers from the LANGUAGE POLICY CONFERENCE, Monday, January 29, 1996
University of Roskilde, Department of Languages and Culture

LIST OF CONTENTS

Robert Phillipson, Roskilde, Denmark
Introduction 5

Claude Truchot, Besançon, France
Why promote European multilingualism? French experience 7

Ulrich Ammon, Duisburg, Germany
German attitudes to European language policy 11

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Roskilde, Denmark
Minority language rights in contemporary Europe 15

Karen Risager, Roskilde, Denmark
Teacher identities in Britain and Denmark in the Europeanisation process 20

Bent Preisler, Roskilde, Denmark
Sub-cultural identities: English-Danish grassroots bilingualism 30

Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Roskilde, Denmark
Danish scholars and languages of scientific communication 33

Bente Maegaard, Copenhagen, Denmark
EU and Danish support for linguistic engineering and computerised translation in a "small" European language: results and implications for the relationshiop between Danish and more widely used languages 43

Annelise Grinsted, Kolding, Denmark
EU-supported studies of Danish perceptions of the need for language policies in the business community 46

Bente Bakmand, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Roskilde, Denmark
Some points from the concluding discussion session 51

Appendix
White Paper on Education and Training 53

This publication, **Papers from the language policy conference, January 29, 1996**, consists of the papers given at the conference, in slightly revised form, and a summary of the concluding discussions. This ROLIG-papir continues the series of language policy publications within the EUROLING project, started with **Papers from the round table on language policy in Europe, Roskilde, April 22, 1994** (ROLIG-papir 52). The contours of language policy as a more coherent research field are explored in **Papers in European language policy** (ROLIG-papir 53, 1995).

We would like to thank those who made the conference possible: those who contributed to the conference, the Department of Languages and culture, University of Roskilde, especially the Head of Department, Uwe Geist, who made funds available to cover some of the expenses of our guests from abroad, Jørgen U. Sand for securing funding for Claude Truchot's travel to Denmark from the French Embassy in Copenhagen, Hartmut Haberland and Anne-Grethe Routley for many supportive acts that help to make things work.

The EUROLING project is partly funded by the Danish National Research Council for the Humanities.

Roskilde, April 1996

Bente Bakmand Robert Phillipson Tove Skutnabb-Kangas

INTRODUCTION

Robert Phillipson

The Department of Languages and Culture has since its establishment two decades ago been involved in many aspects of research into language and the learning of languages. In recent years there has been a move towards a more explicit concern with language policy. International collaboration in research is intensifying.

Four of us in the Department of Languages and Culture have the dubious fame of being described as the "four foreigners of the the University of Roskilde" in the Jutland daily paper, *Jyllandsposten*, 5 years ago, because of an article we had written on Danish language policy[1]. Apparently the paper could not imagine why "foreigners" were worried about the state of the Danish language when Danes were not.

The same paper has recently had an editorial on **European babel**, their term for multilingualism in European Union (EU) institutions, interpretation, translation and the dire consequences of "linguistic nationalism". It reports a Danish member of the European Parliament as bringing to public attention the need to clarify the question of working languages in EU institutions. To my knowledge this Danish paper is the only one to have attempted to give any prominence to European language policy.

As far as I am aware, no **Danish political parties** have an explicit policy on language policy. The Danish government is of course responsible for language policy in the education system. It is also encouraging popular debate on Europeanization (something that all British parties are actively **dis**couraging) in preparation for the 1996 summit that will revise the Maastricht Treaty. Its policy document of 30 November 1995 (reproduced in the newspaper *Information*, 2 December 1995) consists of 2,282 words, not one of which is "language". The government's main goal is to work for peace, stability and welfare in Europe through the inclusion of eastern and central European countries in the EU, but the role of language or languages in this process does not seem to have been addressed.

Paradoxically, one of the leaders of one of the two **Danish parties** that seeks to combat the EU was quoted recently as stating that democracy will have come to the EU when every citizen's command of English enables them to read the "Financial Times". This could indicate that the politicians might need a helping hand when it comes to identifying principles of language policy.

Several of us have been attempting for some years to go beyond the nation state to **collaborate with scholars in other countries**. It is therefore a special pleasure to welcome **Ulrich Ammon**, who has done so much to describe the linguistic dimensions of German as a polycentric language and the diffusion of German worldwide and to theorize language spread as an instrument of state policy. It became clear at a conference in Germany in October 1995 that German politicians seem to have strong views on language policy but unfortunately are unaware of the efforts by academics to describe the field and analyse it.

Likewise it is a particular pleasure to welcome **Claude Truchot**, who was last in Roskilde nearly two years ago, when scholars from Germany, Estonia and Hungary were here to attempt to coordinate supranational language policy research. Claude Truchot has substantial experience of research into the spread of English in France and organized a major conference on European language policy in Besançon in June 1995, in collaboration with the Brussels and Paris bureaucrats who are keen to promote multilingualism. A major feature of this conference was promoting dialogue between researchers in different areas of language policy, in particular language pedagogy, terminology, and machine translation.

---

[1] "Tak for mad! Om sprogæderi med dansk som livret", Hartmut Haberland, Carol Henriksen, Robert Phillipson & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, in **Det danske sprogs status år 2001, er dansk et truet sprog?** ed. J. Normann Jørgensen, Copenhagen: Danmarks Lærerhøjskole, 111-138, reprinted in **Arsberetning 1992** (Annual Report 1992), Department of Languages and Culture, University of Roskilde, 3-27.

It is also a great pleasure to welcome two Danish researchers with substantial experience of EU research cooperation and EU-sponsored research, **Bente Maegaard** of the University of Copenhagen, who directs a centre for language and technology and has many years of experience of developing computer translation systems and software. And **Annelise Grinsted** who has done research into the foreign language needs of private industry, in parallel with research in several EU countries, and the extent to which Danish companies in one particular region of Denmark have or do not have a language policy.

It is perhaps an ironic sign of the times that I read of Annelise Grinsted's work **in London** in a report published there, and of Bente Maegaard's views on investment in Danish linguistic technology **in Besançon**. But then we are all so busy that a conference of today's kind is also an opportunity to hear what colleagues down the corridor are doing. There are papers by **colleagues with ongoing research projects funded by the Danish National Research Council for the Humanities, Bent Preisler** on grassroots bilingualism in Denmark, and **Karen Risager** on teachers' experience of their involvement in the Europeanization process. **Tove Skutnabb-Kangas** reports on minority language rights issues that she is involved in both as a researcher and as an expert for the OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe) High Commissioner on National Minorities.

The other preliminary point to make is that even if much of the political world does not seem to take language policy very seriously, there are in fact many language policies, overt and covert in operation, nationally and internationally. A few brief examples:

- There is concern in Denmark among **upper secondary ("Gymnasium") teachers**, whose language teacher associations organized a one-day meeting in the Danish Parliament on various aspects of language and language learning in November 1996.
- There are moves to establish a "**European Language Council**" to link up higher education institutions concerned with promoting language learning and multilingualism in Europe, with EU funding. National reports on 17 countries were prepared for a conference in June 1995 in Stockholm, the Danish one by Althea Ryan of Århus University.
- There will be EU funding for **scientific networks** linking higher education in new ways, where one of them is likely to be closer international links in research degrees (Ph.D.s).
- **Institutional links** are likely to be **global** in future rather than mainly European. This department is closely involved in preparations for a language rights conference in Hong Kong in June 1996.
- This department has proposed to the Danish National Research Council for the Humanities that **language policy should be a key priority** in the coming five-year period.

So the genesis of this language policy conference is
- a wish to share information in a range of fields within language policy
- to discuss research goals, methods and principles in an open-ended way
- to assess the state of the art in scientific approaches to language policy
- to assess experience, nationally and internationally, at the interface between academic work in this area and decision-makers in the political world.

Why promote European multilingualism?

Claude Truchot, Université de Franche-Comté – Besançon

The European Union. Language situation

The promotion of European multilingualism can be described as a language policy adapted to the present language situation of Europe. This situation can first be characterized by its large diversity as more than 40 languages are historically established within its limits together with several dialects. A new diversity has appeared over the period of the last thirty years, hundreds of languages, often represented by large groups of people, having been inserted by immigration.

This language diversity is related to cultural diversity and also to many fields of expression ranging from science to literature, philosophy or arts. It can therefore be considered as a patrimony.

But this is a heritage which has been unequally distributed. The language situation in the European Union is also characterized by profound inequalities of status between national/official languages and regional or minority languages. Many languages historically established on the territory of nation-states were reduced to private life uses and their use often repressed.

At the end of this century, a number of changes have occurred or are occurring. Real efforts have been made during the last decades to restore some of the uses of minority or regional languages. Claims for linguistic rights are better accepted and recognized, the most recent initiative being the *Charter for regional or minority languages* of the Council of Europe. Nevertheless, if advances have been made in fields such as education and culture, much remains to be done, particularly as far as the presence of these languages in public life is concerned.

As for the new diversity, it is hardly recognized. For lack of proper policies, with a few exceptions, this new multilinguality on the European territory has not yet been transformed into active multilingualism.

In spite of this diversity and of these recent changes monolingualism is still the predominant sociolinguistic status within the European Union and has become the linguistic condition of a large number of people in Western Europe.

Languages and globalization

Paradoxically the process of globalization of exchanges and internationalization of society which Europe is undergoing at the end of this century does not favour the diffusion of cultures and languages. Not only are they not promoted, but their vitality is also reduced.

This needs to be explained. Under constraints of productivity, numerous activities in trade and industry are now being organized on a much larger scale than that of a single country. At a higher stage of development they are organized at the level of the planet. They are globalized. Most the markets of goods and services have undergone this transformation, but other fields are also largely concerned, like scientific research, technological development, communication, more particularly computerized communication, and large sectors of culture and leisure.

A consequence of this transformation is that languages as vehicles of these activities have now to compete on what constitutes for them as well a market. But very few are able to carry internationally, and even less worldwide, all the activities involved. To get a share of that market it is necessary for a language to fulfill a number of conditions, among which a large demographic weight, strong economic backing, previously established international spread (an outer circle), international recognition (through institutions), a high level of modernization (an up to date terminology, the use of all the instruments of language engineering). Only English fulfills all these conditions. In the European Union, apart from English, the only languages which fulfill some of these conditions are German and French. Spanish and Italian can rank somewhere behind, but all the others are more or less excluded.

Another linguistic consequence is that languages which were protected by borders are now challenged on their own territory where their users are faced with the demands of world communication. At the moment none but English can meet the demands. It is all the more difficult for languages which fulfill too few of the conditions listed above. Yet it is the way they can meet the demands which will

secure their future at least in such vital fields as science, economy, culture and communication, and even in some aspects of public life like education.

Languages and the European Single Market

If the process of globalization can be said to restrict the use of most languages, one would think that the building of European unity promotes them.

In fact up to recently the main objective of the policies conceived and implemented in the European Union was to make free way for the circulation of goods, people and services. The linguistic consequences are not very different from the ones imposed by globalization: promoting English as a lingua franca, widening inequalities between languages.

Different attitudes have also been generated. For quite a few Europeans the main aim is to liberalize the markets whatever the social consequences. And they are not even prepared to consider that linguistic consequences are social consequences. There are also lots of people who feel that they have to adapt. But protective steps have also been taken, like language regulations for the protection of consumers, as in Denmark, Belgium and France.

More and more people are aware of the problem, mostly through the cultural consequences of such a situation. For them, European languages have played a part in the development of thought and cultural creation. A European Community where cultures would be reduced in their potentialities, restricted within communities and inaccessible to non-natives of these communities because the languages which carry them cannot be used for their diffusion abroad, is not the Europe they want to have. For many people building Europe is a means of sharing diversity, an ideal which is far from cultural and linguistic normalization. Less people are aware of the other linguistic consequences because all of them are not so blatant.

Prospects

In more than one respect, the sociolinguistic changes taking place at the moment in Europe are as important as the ones which took place during last century when languages which were not promoted as national and official languages were excluded from public life. Though it is difficult to make predictions, it is likely that this time the consequences will not be as dramatic, at least for the languages which are well inserted in public life. But one of the fundamental social roles of a language being to enable people who identify with it to communicate in all fields, it will be more and more difficult for a large number of languages both to meet the challenges of world communication and to hold this social role.

A European language policy

If we consider the problems raised, both by globalization and by the europeanization of the economy, it is at the European level that a language policy should be defined. The idea according to which the European Union would be a relevant framework for a language policy is making its way. The European institutions have been ascribed capacities in other fields than the ones related to the building of the Single Market. And though these capacities do not extend to language policies, a field reserved to member states, the European Commission can define and finance actions, notably within its research and education programmes. Initiatives can be taken by member states, and presented for adoption to their fellow members in the European Council, when it is their turn to chair the Union.

At this level not all initiatives can reach general consent. We can presume that a language policy will be seen in English-speaking areas as less necessary than it will be elsewhere. Some countries consider that their language should compete internationally and hope to get a share of the globalization process. This is the case of France, Germany and Spain. But countries with lesser used languages are not ready to side with them on this objective. So measures have to be defined which are beneficial for all languages.

The idea of defining measures which could reach general consent was the approach of the small group of people which I can refer to as the "Besançon group" as their action lead to a conference which met in Besançon in June 1995.

This approach is based on the analysis of the situation which I have briefly summed up. The main objective which stands out from this analysis is that existing multilinguality has to transformed into active multilingualism. To reach this aim two directions can be explored: extending the number of languages learnt and known; extending their use by making them more attractive, that is to say by inserting them into modernity.

Language teaching is the core of this policy. In Europe over the last fifteen years language teaching has been considerably developed. But the figures show that this was to the advantage of very few languages, mostly English. French and German also seem to have got some advantages but they are far behind. If we want other languages to be known and used it is necessary to find ways of promoting linguistic diversification.

The relevance to a policy of diversification of a number of recent teaching trends has to be examined. This the case of early or "precocious" learning of a foreign language and bilingual teaching. The position taken is that these methods are particularly adapted to existing multilingual contexts. Promoting minority languages or languages of minority communities would not only insure more linguistic rights, but also equip people better for an internationalized context and collectively raise the general level of multilingualism in Europe.

But in monolingual contexts teaching from an early age means at the moment teaching the same languages, mostly English longer. To promote diversity it is necessary to offer several languages and to convince people to learn them. One way which is tried out is called **language awareness**, or **educazione linguistica**, or **éveil aux langues**. It consists in making people aware of language diversity and in teaching it before any specific language is taught.

If the aim is to multiply the number of languages taught at school, we have to accept that for some of them the objectives are less extensive. With the model of a polyglot dialogue where every speaker keeps to his/her mother tongue but is understood, efforts are concentrated on the teaching of language comprehension. Up to now the most successful experiments have been done on languages situated very close to one another on a family tree, like Romance or Scandinavian languages. Thus teaching simultaneously the comprehension of Spanish, Italian, Portugese, Catalan and French can already be envisaged. But extending the experiments should be tried out.

It was thought by the organizers of the Besançon conference that it was necessary to associate to language teaching other fields which can contribute to the building of linguistic pluralism and to define their respective parts in the language policy. One of the aims of this policy being to insert languages within modernity, fields like language engineering and terminology should be integrated. The development of new technologies and the creation of language engineering tools can ensure permanent usage to those languages that will benefit from them (for example automated tools for helping to write in one's language or in a foreign language, such as electronic dictionaries, grammar and style checkers, terminological data banks, processing systems for translation). At the moment they are accessible for too few languages. Ways to make them accessible for most languages have to be looked for. In the same way terminology can be considered as an essential means for the implementation of a policy of language pluralism, as terminology work is fundamental for multilingual specialised information to be disseminated.

This approach was first described in a document which was distributed in november 1994 and which was used to call for a conference of experts which met in Besançon. This conference, the title of which was "Building linguistic pluralism", got the support of the French Presidency of the European Union and that of the European Commission. A number of propositions were made, exposed and discussed, and collected in a report.

Initiatives for the future

It was generally felt in Besançon that the enterprise should go on. This conference in Roskilde means that the work is going on. It was also considered that the field of expertise should be extended. Promoting language diversification in the teaching of foreign languages, extending the products of language engineering to a larger number of languages, developing multilingual terminology, are basic objectives. But there should also be, upstream of language policies more analyses of language situations, downstream reliable procedures to evaluate them.

One of the recommendations made in Besançon was that this field could best be covered if there was on the European level a permanent institution of expertise in language policy. The organizing committee

has taken the initiative of constituting an association which could carry the project. This association is now constituted, with an international committee and a platform to promote a project called *Observatoire des politiques linguistiques en Europe/Observatory of language policies in Europe* (See below).

The nature of such a permanent institution has to be defined. It can be a network of experts working in the different fields of language policy. The general idea is to put this expertise at the disposal of institutions which have to intervene in the field of language policy, be they European, international, national, regional. It could study situations, propose actions, make evaluations, inform people, train experts. It shall have to be independent of language policy institutions or any pressure group.

The chances of seeing the European Union use the resources of this observatory depends on its adopting a language policy.

Some initiatives have already been taken. Thus in 1989 was launched the the Lingua programme which has helped to develop language teaching and learning. Its scope is now being enlarged within the new education programmes Socrates and Leonardo. Adopted in november 1995 the *White book on education* sets as an aim that each European should know three languages. The European Commission has now to define the means of reaching this objective.

The European Commission has also approved in november 1995 a Community programme called *MLIS, Multilingualism in the Information Society*. This programme is proposed to run for a period of three years and will cover such actions as supporting the construction of an infrastructure for European language resources, expanding the language industries and promoting the use of advanced language tools in the European public sector.

Linguistic problems have begun to be discussed at the political level. In 1995 the European Council, the main political authority within the Union, has adopted a text entitled *"Conclusions of the Council on language diversity and linguistic pluralism within the European Union"*. This text invites the Commission to make inventory of the actions and policies which inside the Union take into account language diversity and linguistic pluralism, and to evaluate them. The promotion of linguistic pluralism in the actions and policies of the Union should be looked after by a proper authority. This does not go very far in the direction of building a language policy, but it is a first step. The authority for linguistic pluralism has not yet been established, but the inventory of actions is being made.

But going further than that means political choices which do not depend on linguistic expertise. The linguistic consequences of globalization and of europeanization of the economy are social consequences. And there are different ways of tackling them. They might even not be tackled. The role of experts is to make people aware that they can be tackled and to offer reliable ways of tackling them. Beyond this it is up to citizens to decide.

Documents:

The Preliminary and Final Reports of the Besançon 1995 Conference and the Platform for an *Observatory of Language Policies in Europe* can be obtained from: Association L'observatoire linguistique/Language Observatory, 3, Faubourg Tarragnoz, F-25 000 Besançon.

German attitudes to European language policy

Ulrich Ammon

1. The cringe after WW II
2. The growth of a new assertiveness
3. The objective background
4. Continuing inhibition
5. Awareness of the political experts versus broad unawareness

1. The cringe after WW II

"Le français est la langue de la conversation, et en diplomatie, tout se traite en causant. Les manifestes, les notes, les traités se rédigent en français: on parle français quand on veut s'adresser à l'Europe." (*La Civilisation Française* 1964: 174) This quote from one of the most popular textbooks for studying French in Germany expresses quite correctly the prevalent German attitude, or more precisely that exposed in official policy in the Federal Republic, until well into the 1960's. It was also indicative of this attitude that Walter Hallstein, the German President of the European Commission from 1958 to 1967, never objected to French functioning as practically the sole working language of the political body over which he presided, or that no objection was raised, at least not officially, when French politicians publicly pictured their language as the lingua franca of a future united Europe without mentioning German (cf. Haarmann 1973: 122-130).

Similarly, though on a different level, the German Government tacitly accepted regular communications in English from the American Embassy in Bonn – in spite of the fact that there has been an explicit and internationally accepted rule which makes German the sole language of communication between foreign embassies and the German Government in the German capital. It dates back to Bismarck and would probably not have been introduced by the government of the Federal Republic; it has, however, been kept up and observed by all the other embassies except the American (cf. Ammon 1991: 322-329).

The acceptance of French linguistic aspiration and American language choice without the least objection can partially be explained by a general German cringe after Nazism and World War II. Also, in the decades after the war, the German government gave priority to recovering for the country the status of a somewhat normal member of the "family of nations". Language questions were too unimportant to care about in these years.

2. The growth of a new assertiveness

It was during the 1960's when Germany, the Western as well the Eastern state, gradually became more assertive again, also linguistically. The government of the Federal Republic had for instance worked out an official report about *"Die Situation der deutschen Sprache in der Welt"* (1967). There, various proposals were made as to the possibilities of strengthening the international standing of German which was perceived as declining and not as it had been or should be in comparison to other languages. The amount of money made available for external cultural policy was increased and the promotion of the German language abroad was designated more explicitly than before as an important part of such policy. This development has continued and has gained momentum since (cf. Ammon 1991: 540-562).

It was then, among other things, also pointed out that German was one of the important languages of Europe, and that this fact should be mirrored in its role in the political bodies of the European Community. The idea that French should, in the end, be the sole working language of these bodies became unacceptable, and gradually any solution which excluded German from this function has come to be unsatisfactory. In the 1980's, the German government issued a regulation to its officials in the EC that they should, as a rule, speak German in the proceedings. There have been repeatedly more or less open complaints on the part of the German government that the use of German was neglected in the political bodies of the EC. In the 1990's, an administrative position was established within the Foreign Ministry in Bonn with the primary task on observing whether German was given its due share in the official communication of the EC or,

later, the EU. The German government has also successfully worked towards a regulation in the European Commission which was introduced recently and which states that the papers and proposals for the Commission have to be available in German too, not only in French or English, before proceedings can start. This is seen as an important step towards establishing German as one of the working languages of the EU, which is, in fact, one of the most important objectives of German language policy. In the frame of this objective, German is usually seen as the third working language, together - and perhaps also behind - French and English, but other languages have not been explicitly excluded (cf. Schloßmacher 1996).

3. The objective background

Let me present now some data as to the background of the German attitudes towards their language and German language policy. German is in various respects one of the major languages of Europe or, more specifically, of the European Union.

(1) As an official language of countries.

Language	*Number of countries in which official on the national level*
French/German	3 (France, Belgium, Luxemburg/Germany, Austria, Luxemburg)
Dutch/English	2 (Netherlands, Belgium/United Kingdom, Ireland)
Danish, Finnish, Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, Swedish	1

Table 1: Number of countries in which the official EU languages have official status on the national level

The position of German does not decline vis-à-vis the other languages if we include national status on a regional level, which German has in Italy and Belgium.

(2) Numerical strength as a native language (mother tongue).

Language	*Number of native speakers*
German	84,091,000
English	61,173,000
French	60,074,000
Italian	53,571,000
Spanish	28,377,000
Dutch	17,952,000
Swedish	10,745,000
Greek	10,125,000
Portuguese	9,656,000
Danish	5,035,000
Finnish	4,888,000

Table 2: Numerical strength of official EU languages as a mother tongue within the EU (figures from between 1990 and 1993, following *Der Fischer Weltalmanach 1996*)

(3) Economic strength of language, or rather language community (native speakers).

Language	*GNP*
German	1,764,577,000
French	1,234,848,000
Italian	939,718,000
English	930,383,000
Dutch	416,755,000
Spanish	352,444,000
Swedish	216,514,000
Danish	131,473,000
Finnish	81,116,000
Portuguese	73,598,000
Greek	73,087,000

Table 3: Economic strength of official EU languages within the EU in 1993 (US $ in millions, following *Der Fischer Weltalmanach 1996*)

The economic strength has been calculated in proportion to the share of native speakers of each language in each country.

(4) Students of the language as a foreign language ("foreign language study strength").

Language	*Number of students in public schools*
English	18,133,320
French	9,088,163
German	2,888,011
Spanish	1,385,801
Italian	215,840
Dutch	212,214
Portuguese	13,709
Greek (Modern)	80
Danish	0

Table 4: Number of students studying the language as a foreign language in public schools within the EC around 1986 (Eurydice 1989)

These figures for students are not up to date. It seems, however, safe to say that the proportion of German has not become smaller, particularly not vis-à-vis French, as a consequence of the extension of the EC, and it will also not become smaller in case the EU were to extend further East in the future.

These figures somehow illuminate the background of the official German expectations that German should be one of the working languages of the EU or should generally play an important role as a language in Europe.

4. Continuing inhibition

It should be pointed out, in order to avoid misunderstanding, that what I have called the new German assertiveness has never had the kind of self-confidence which the French or British are known to show with respect to their own language. There have always been mixed feelings and prestigious voices opposing it or criticizing external language policy in general, recalling recent German history and warning against dangers of dominating the smaller language communities linguistically. Especially the standing of the German language has always widely been felt to be definitely less important than European unity, of which French-German "Freundschaft" has persistently been seen as the cornerstone. I have even encountered quite

often the argument which has, however, hardly been put forward publicly, that the Germans should let the British and the French have their linguistic superiority for the sake of more overall equality among the larger countries of the EU. This argument could be heard particularly after German unification as an attempt to soothe British and French concerns about German economic and numerical dominance in the EC.

It seems to me that under the surface of the new linguistic assertiveness there is a lot of uncertainty as to what could be the adequate role of the German language in a future united Europe. I must admit that I am myself uncertain as to what the German-speaking countries should expect in that respect and what they should do in terms of external language politics.

5. Awareness of the political experts versus broad unawareness

Generally, vagueness and uncertainty seem to be the prevalent German attitudes towards language policy as in most European countries with the exception perhaps of France. Even among politicians there is little awareness of language problems, except among the relatively small group of experts who are involved in foreign cultural policy. The majority of the population could, it seems to me, hardly care less. The bits and pieces of reports or comments in the mass media have had no awakening effect.

However, the topic has the potential of being politicized. I have often enough experienced that people, even Germans, can take their language very seriously. Thus, I have repeatedly observed that discussants, who beforehand hardly showed any interest in the topic, quickly came to emphatically demanding a fair standing of the German language on the level of the EU, which in effect meant a privileged standing. The usual reasoning in such cases has been an appeal to democratic principles, like that the "biggest language", i. e. the language of the numerically strongest group, should at the same time play a major role within the greater community.

I assume, therefore, that serious conflicts about language questions in Europe are possible in the future, and could even be dangerous and disruptive. This is why these problems and the possibilities of an adequate language policy for Europe should be studied more intensively. It is symptomatic of the state of the art that this paper had to be mainly based on impressions and bits and pieces of information, since German attitudes to European language policy have not been studied systematically so far.

References

Ammon, Ulrich (1991) *Die internationale Stellung der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.

Eurydice (1989) *Teaching of Languages in the European Community: Statistics* (Working Document). Brussels: Eurydice.

Haarmann, Harald (1973) *Grundfragen der Sprachenregelung in den Staaten der Europäischen Gemeinschaft*. Hamburg: Stiftung Europa-Kolleg.

Der Fischer Weltalmanach 1996. Frankfurt a. M: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.

Die Situation der deutschen Sprache in der Welt (1967) *Bundestagsdrucksache* V/2344. Bonn.

La Civilisation Française. Lesebuch für die Oberklassen. (1964) F. Hofmann & W. Morlang (eds.), 16th ed. Frankfurt a. M.: Hirschgraben.

Schloßmacher, Michael (1996) *Die Amtssprachen in den Organen der Europäischen Gemeinschaft*. Frankfurt a. M. etc.: Lang.

Minority language rights in contemporary Europe

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas

A growing number of charters, resolutions and declarations in Europe give some linguistic human rights to traditional regional or national minorities. On the other hand, in binding human rights law, (im)migrant minorities have so far not had any linguistic rights in education to use and maintain their languages. I shall give a short overview of the UN and European instruments on language rights and assess the degree of protection that they grant, especially in education. Education is central in assessing linguistic human rights. Those who are denied linguistic human rights are in most cases minorities (at least in terms of power but mostly also in terms of numbers). Without extensive language rights in education (the right to mother tongue medium education) most minorities will assimilate, i.e. the existing linguistic diversity will be killed.

International instruments

Article 27 of the **UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights** (ICCPR, 1966, in force since 1976) still grants the best **binding** minority language protection so far:

> "In those states in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their own religion, or to use their own language."

This article has been the most important Article in international law so far for the protection of linguistic minorities, as both Capotorti (1979, the UN Special Rapporteur on minorities) and more recent UN reports confirm. Both the **UN Conventions on the Rights of the Child** (1959 and 1989), and several Council of Europe and OSCE documents have used approximately the same formulation. I will come back to the interpretation of Article 27 below.

The five basic UN conventions have **general** provisions, for instance in their preambles, which relate to the exercise of all human rights, and language is in most cases specifically mentioned, at the same level as gender, race, religion, etc., as one of the characteristics on the basis of which individuals cannot be discriminated. This is in contrast with the **education** clauses of the covenants. In many cases language is **not even mentioned** under the **education clauses** of those covenants which are binding. Often all the other characteristics (gender, religion, nationality, social origins, etc) are still there, but language has mysteriously disappeared. Even in those cases where language is mentioned, the rights can be described as no stronger than **half-covert assimilation-oriented toleration** of minority languages. Minorities are allowed to use their languages in private, but not in state-financed schools.

The same is also true in many regional covenants. Despite many many nice phrases about linguistic rights in **non-binding** declarations and resolutions, in those international or European covenants which **are legally binding**, and where there is a complaint procedure, there were until the 1990s almost no linguistic rights. The general policy on educational linguistic human rights seems to be a posture policy, without much content.

The **UN Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities**, adopted by the General Assembly in December 1992) goes somewhat further than the important Article 27 above, in its Article 2.1, by replacing "shall not be denied" by "have the right" and by adding that these rights apply "in private and in public, freely and without any form of discrimination" and in Articles 4.1 and, especially, 4.2, which prompt the states to actively promote enjoyment of the rights.

Most of the Articles in the Declaration use the formulation "shall" and have few let-out modifications or alternatives - except where linguistic rights in education (Art. 4.3) are concerned. Here again, just as in the European Charter (see below), the alternatives permit a reluctant state to provide minimalist protection:

> 4.3. States *should* take *appropriate* measures so that, <u>*wherever possible*</u>, persons belonging to

> minorities have *adequate* opportunities to learn their mother tongue or to have instruction in their mother tongue. (my emphasis)

Clearly such a formulation raises many questions. What constitute "appopriate measures" or "adequate opportunities", and who is to decide what is "possible"? Does "instruction in" the mother tongue mean "through the medium of the mother tongue" or does it only mean instruction in the mother tongue as a subject? Besides, the Declaration is not binding on the States.

The **UN Convention on Migrant Workers and Their Families** accords minimal rights to the mother tongues and is assimilation-oriented (see Hasenau 1990).

Regional European instruments

Council of Europe has been important in suggesting protection to national minorities. Its **European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages** (22 June 1992), commits, in Article 5, those member states which sign and ratify it, among other things to encourage the use of minority languages, in speech and writing, in public and private life. In education, the teaching and study of regional and minority languages should be encouraged at all appropriate stages.

The **Charter** will enter into force 3 months after minimally 5 member states have ratified it. In the 3½ years since it acceptance, only 3 countries have both signed and ratified it (Finland, Hungary and Norway) while another 11 countries have signed but not ratified[1].

The languages of immigrant minorities are explicitly excluded from the **Charter**. In addition, the countries signing it can decide which minorities they want to apply it to, i.e. even if they accept that a group in their country is a minority, they do not necessarily need to extend the rights to this group. The Charter is full of escape clauses and alternatives which make it possible for an unwilling state to sign and ratify it and still grant very few rights even to a froup that the state has promised to apply it to (see Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1994 for details).

Another relevant **Council of Europe** initiative, drafted by one of its bodies, the European Commission for Democracy through Law, was the "**Proposal for a European Convention for the Protection of Minorities**" (CDL 91 - 7, which was accompanied by a substantial Explanatory Report (CDL 91 - 8).

It is important to note here that the term used in the **Proposal** was simply "minorities", not "**national** minorities". The Proposal had an explicit definition of who belongs to the minorities the Convention was supposed to protect:

> *Article 2*
>
> 1. For the purposes of this Convention, the term "minority" shall mean a group which is smaller in number than the rest of the population of a State, whose members, who are nationals of that State, have ethnical, religious or linguistic features different from those of the rest of the population, and are guided by the will to safeguard their culture, traditions, religion or language.
>
> 2. Any group coming within the terms of this definition shall be treated as an ethnic, religious or linguistic minority.
>
> 3. To belong to a national minority shall be a matter of individual choice and no disadvantage may arise from the exercise of such choice.

This definition might, in fact, have made it possible for immigrants who have taken the citizenship of the new country, to become minorities, since the existence of a minority would have been decided upon on objective grounds. A state would not have been able to claim that they do not have any minorities if the group claiming minority status would have fulfilled objectively specified conditions. But it was not to be.

At the Vienna Summit Conference (8-9 October 1993), the Heads of State and Government of the Member States of the Council of Europe decided not to proceed with the **Proposal**. Instead, they instructed the Committee of Ministers "to draft with minimum delay a framework convention specifying the principles which the contracting States commit themselves to respect, in order to assure the protection of **national** minorities" (Hartig 1995, 1, my emphasis)[2]. The Ad Hoc Committee for the Protection of National Minorities (CAHMIN) completed drafting in October 1994. The **Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities** was adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 10 November 1994, a year after the work on it was started. It is also open for non-member States. It has (by 1 October 1995)

been signed by 31 states[3] but only been ratified by 4 whereas 12 are needed for it to enter into force. The framework **Convention** is, according to Hartig (1995, 2), "the first ever legally binding multilateral instrument devoted to the protection of national minorities in general". The philosophy behind the **Convention** is that "it is not always enough to provide a legal guarantee of equality" (Hartig 1995, 2) (the establishment of effective equality between persons belonging to national minorities and others in the State being an aim of the **Convention**). Therefore, the **Convention** "also identifies objectives which the States undertake to achieve and which will require positive measures. These measures may entail positive discrimination" (ibid.). As far as the medium of education is concerned, we again find that the Article covering this is more heavily qualified than anything else in the Framework Convention:

> In areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities traditionally or in substantial numbers, **if there is sufficient demand**, the parties shall **endeavour** to ensure, **as far as possible** and **within the framework of their education systems**, that persons belonging to those minorities have **adequate** opportunities for being taught in the minority language **or** for receiving instruction in this language. (Article 14.2; my emphases).

Even international lawyers who are normally very careful seem to consider this provision as "weak" and "unsatisfactory - given the general context of the Convention as a whole as only a "framework" for action by States" (Thornberry 1995, 13).

But again, immigrant minorities are effectively excluded even from this weak provision. This is shown by the changes, as compared to the **"Proposal for a European Convention for the Protection of Minorities"** discussed above. The **Proposal** gave a definition of minorities which would have made it possible for immigrant minorities to be included. The **Framework Convention** has no definition of minorities whatsoever. The **Proposal** talked about "minorities", the **Convention** specifies that it is only for "**national** minorities" - and since these are not defined, the State can still deny the existence of minorities, especially immigrant minorities who can easily be juxtaposed to national minorities.

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) became from the late 1980s a major forum for East-West links and for specifying what human rights should obtain in the member countries. **The** (1990) **Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE** (now OSCE) states unambiguously that **national** minorities should have the right to maintain their ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious identity, the right to seek voluntary and public assistance to do so in educational institutions, and should not be subjected to assimilation against their will (CSCE 1990a, 40).

CSCE uses in its definition of minorities one of the clauses which the proposed European Convention for the Protection of Minorities used (see above):

> (32) To belong to a national minority is a matter of a person's individual choice and no disadvantage may arise from the exercise of such choice.

One could imagine that this individual choice was also given to immigrant minorities - but they are obviously not included here either. The States are willing to accept that they are some kind of human beings too, but their rights will (hopefully) be examined at some future point:

> (22) The participating States reaffirm that the protection and promotion of the rights of migrant workers have their human dimension. In this context, they ...
>
> (22.4) - express their readiness to examine, at future CSCE meetings, the relevant aspects of the further promotion of the rights of migrant workers and their families.

So far, OSCE (earlier CSCE) has not agreed on any binding conventions. An OSCE High Commissioner on **National** Minorities (Max van der Stoel) was appointed in 1992 (my emphasis).

The European Parliament's **Directive on the education of the children of migrant workers** (77/466/EEC of 25.7.77) is fraught with difficulties of interpretation and implementation (as the Parliament's own **Report drawn up on behalf of the Committee of Inquiry into RACISM and XENOPHOBIA** (A3-195/90, PE 141.205/FIN, 111) indicates). It only recommends a few hours of teaching of the mother tongue as a subject. Having signed it, for instance the Danes have still several times

suggested that the teaching of migrant minorities mother tongue should be stopped after the fourth grade or stopped altogether – and it seems that the Social Democratic Party may now succeed in getting a parliamentary majority for their suggestion of converting the mother tongue lessons to Danish lessons.

Future...

Many countries are, actively or passively, trying to prevent the acceptance of linguistic human rights. For instance Greece and Turkey, have not signed the ICCPR (containing the important Article 27). Of the almost 120 States which **have** ratified ICCPR, the United States and Haiti are the only ones who have **failed** to ratify the UN Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Eide 1995a, 23), which contains **some** linguistic and educational rights. Germany and Britain have not ratified its Optional Protocol which gives access to the complaint procedure. At the OSCE Copenhagen meeting on the Human Dimension in June 1990, France, Greece and Turkey did not go along with some far-reaching formulations for the benefit of minorities. When the Council of Europe's European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages was accepted (June 1992), France, Turkey and United Kingdom abstained, Greece voted against (**Contact Bulletin** 9:2, 1992, 1), and until now only 3 states have ratified it as stated above. Thus the United States, Britain, France, Greece and Turkey have often prevented or tried to prevent the granting of linguistic human rights. This has not prevented Britain, France and the United States from presenting themselves as protectors of human rights and minorities, and criticizing other countries for **their** treatment of minorities. There is not much reason for optimism - except, maybe, in one sense ...

In the customary reading of the UN ICCPR Article 27 above, rights were only granted to individuals, not collectivities. And "persons belonging to ... minorities" only had these rights *in states which accept that the minorities exist*. This has not helped immigrant minorities in any countries because they have not been seen as minorities in the legal sense by the states.[4] So far, the Article has been interpreted as

- excluding (im)migrants (who have not been seen as minorities);
- excluding groups (even if they are citizens) which are not recognised as minorities by the State (in the same way as the European Charter does);
- only conferring some protection from discrimination (= "negative rights") but not a positive right to maintain or even use one's language.
- not imposing any obligations on the States.

Recently (6 April 1994) the UN Human Rights Committee adopted a General Comment on Article 27 which interprets it in a substantially more positive way than earlier. The Committee sees the Article as

- protecting all individuals on the State's territory or under its jurisdiction (i.e. also immigrants and refugees), irrespective of whether they belong to the minorities specified in the Article or not;
- stating that the existence of a minority does not depend on a decision by the State but requires to be established by objective criteria;
- recognizing the existence of a "right";
- imposing positive obligations on the States.

What are the possible implications of the General Comment on the educational linguistic human rights of (im)migrant minorities? The answer is that we do not know yet. Neither does the Human Rights Committee (Eide 1995b). It remains to be seen to what extent this General Comment will influence the State parties. If the Committee's interpretation ("soft law") becomes the general norm, and if the Western European countries where migrant and refugee minorities live start observing this norm, the educational linguistic rights might improve.

The questions at stake which I propose for our discussion are, how states can be persuaded to see the obvious three points

- that a linguistic nation-state ideology (believing in a necessary and beneficial congruence between state, nation and language) is irrational and harmful,
- that granting linguistic human rights to everybody, including minorities, is an antidote to ethnic conflict, not its cause, and
- that the maintenance and development of linguistic and cultural diversity is as important for the future of the planet as biodiversity.

References:

Capotorti, Francesco (1979). *Study of the Rights of Persons Belonging to Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities*. New York: United Nations.

Eide, Asbjørn (1995a). Economic, social and cultural rights as human rights. In Eide, Krause & Rosas (Eds.), 21-40.

Eide, Asbjørn, Krause, Catarina & Rosas, Allan (Eds.) (1995). *Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. A Textbook*. Dordrecht, Boston & London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Eide, Asbjørn (1995b). Private communication, at the Expert Consultation on Minority Education, OSCE

High Commissioner on National Minorities, The Hague, November 18 1995.

Hartig, Hanno (1995). Protection of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities. Statement in Subsidiary Working Party I, 10.10.1995, by Dr Hanno Hartig, Head of Minorities Section, Directorate of Human Rights, Council of Europe. Ms.

Hasenau, M. (1990). Setting norms in the United Nations system: the draft Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and their Families in relation to ILO in Standards on Migrant Workers, *International Migration* XXVIII:2, 133-157.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1995a). Minority education: International standards and domestic practices. Paper presented at the Expert Consultation on Minority Education, OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, The Hague, November 18 1995.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (in press a). The colonial legacy in educational language planning in Scandinavia - from migrant labour to a national ethnic minority? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 1996. vol. 118. Special Issue (6, 1996, February/March). Dua, Hans (Ed.). Language Planning and Political Theory, 81-105.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (in press b). Promotion of Linguistic Tolerance and Development. In Fettes, Mark & Legér, Sylvie (Eds.) *Towards a Language Agenda: Futurist Outlook on the United Nations*. Papers from a Conference organised by the Canadian Center of Language Rights and the Law Department, Ottawa, 25-27 May 1995.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Phillipson, Robert 1994. Linguistic human rights, past and present. In Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (Eds.), 71-110.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Phillipson, Robert (Eds., in collaboration with Mart Rannut) 1994. *Linguistic Human Rights. Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Contributions to the Sociology of Language, 67. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Thornberry, Patrick 1995. International standards concerning educational rights in general and the rights of minorities in particular. Paper presented at the Expert Consultation on Minority Education, OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, The Hague, November 18 1995.

Notes:

1 These countries were (by 1 October 1995) Austria, Cyprus, Denmark, Germany, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Romania, Spain and Switzerland (Hartig 1995, 4).

2 In addition, the Committee of Ministers was instructed "to begin work on drafting a protocol complementing the European Convention oh Human Rights in the cultural field by provisions guaranteeing individual rights, in particular for persons belonging to national minorities" (Hartig 1995, 2).

3 Of the member States, the following have not yet signed: Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, France, Greece and Turkey. Ukraine has signed, despite not being a member State.

4 Finns in Sweden have tried and the Swedish response has so far been negative – see Skutnabb-Kangas, in press a. In October 1995 the Prime Minister accepted to at least **receive** the Sweden Finnish minority declaration – after more than 3 years...

Language policy in practice
The language teacher and linguistic diversity in Europe

Karen Risager

Language teachers and European integration

The following reflexions are based upon results from an international research project on language teachers' identity in the process of European integration. The aim of the project is to investigate how language teachers perceive their role as teachers of culture in the light of European integration.

The background of the project is the modernization process which has taken place within foreign language teaching during the last 20-30 years, and which has had as one the chief results that studies of modern culture and society have become an ever more recognized and important part of the teaching. At the same time this domain of studies has been very open-ended, as it has to a large extent been up to the teachers themselves to define content and objectives. The teaching and learning about culture and society may be very diverse indeed, depending both on material and structural conditions and on the general and professional outlook of the individual teacher.

Seen in the context of the cultural and linguistic processes characterizing Europe in these years, foreign languages can be said to be in an historically significant situation implying a break with a long tradition. In continuance of a tradition dating back to the middle of the last century, foreign language teachers generally conceive of themselves as only responsible for teaching about the countries where the language in question is spoken as a first language, putting special emphasis on the biggest European countries - Germany, France and so on, that is, they work within the perspective of the nation, which presupposes a connection between the national culture and the national language.

The integration process in Europe, and the internationalization process in general, question this self-conception seriously. In fact, the new situation implies new definitions of both the concept of culture and the concept of language. Language teachers have to construct a new professional identity.

The ideas of a European perspective in foreign language teaching point to expectations that foreign language teaching should expand the group of target countries, ideally to all European countries. Thus language teaching may be expected to include - more often than it does today - other countries where the language in question is spoken as a first language, e.g. Belgium or Switzerland, as well as other countries where the language is spoken as a foreign language by some, e.g. Greece, Holland, the Nordic countries, Czechia, or the Baltic countries. The large number of study visits and pupil exchanges across Europe, as well as cross-national communication by electronic mail, are driving forces in this development.

The concept of culture may to a greater extent come to incorporate cross-cultural processes and influences, as well as similarities and differences not only between the foreign country and the pupils own, but also between any other countries. Culture teaching may possibly focus more on developing a general readiness to make oneself acquainted with foreign cultures of any sort. The concept of language may to a greater extent include language used as a lingua franca, i.e. in situations where none of the speakers use that language as a first language - situations that exhibit a very complicated cultural structure. Questions concerning cultural and linguistic diversity and complexity may be put more overtly on the agenda.

The language teacher is an agent of language policy

Language teachers make a number of choices that among other things influence pupils' knowledge of and attitudes to such matters as diversity and relations of dominance in the linguistic domain, e.g. within Europe. When the language teacher prepares pupils for, e.g., an exchange visit to a specific area, gives them advice on language use for accomplishment of the visit, and helps them with post-visit activities of various kinds, his or her conscious and unconscious attitudes and evaluations concerning languages are necessarily reflected in practice.

In what follows, I will focus on some implicit attitudes that can be deduced from the results of the above-mentioned research project, especially those related to the awareness of linguistic diversity. It should be noted that we have not directly asked teachers about their language policies. Our interpretations are

based upon teachers' utterances on how they have taught culture in practice, and what experience they have had with personal contacts abroad.

Some data on the project

The project comprises two parallel subprojects, one in Denmark and one in England. In Denmark the focus is on foreign language teachers (English, German, and French) in primary and lower secondary school (the "folkeskole"), and in England on foreign language teachers in secondary school (many languages, but mainly French). The Danish project involves four researchers: Karen Risager (project leader, Roskilde University), Pia List (Odense University), and Gerd Gabrielsen and John Gulloev Christensen (The Royal Danish School of Educational Studies). The English project is run by Michael Byram (University of Durham) and colleagues.

The data collection, which is now complete, comprises a questionnaire study and an interview study. A questionnaire containing 84 questions was answered by 643 teachers in Denmark and by 112 teachers in England (North and South-Central). 43 Danish and 18 English teachers were interviewed. Interviews lasted about an hour and a half, and focused on teachers' attitudes and practice related to the cultural dimension of language teaching, on their attitudes to changes in Europe, and on the type and extent of their contacts abroad.

Internationalization sometimes means separation of language and culture

Before results from the project are presented, the relationship between language and culture needs to be problematized at a more theoretical level[1]. Language teachers generally maintain that language and culture are connected. This phrase, however, is both right and wrong, depending on what you mean by these two concepts, and how you conceive the relationship between them. In what follows, I will distinguish between three conceptions of culture in their relation to language:

1. Culture as contained in the semantics and pragmatics of language
2. Culture as context for language use
3. Culture as thematic content in language teaching.

I will also distinguish between descriptive and normative meanings of the phrase "language and culture are connected". In the descriptive meaning you say that language and culture are in fact connected, in the normative meaning you say that language and culture should be connected.

In my view, there is no necessary connection between language and culture in the two conceptions referred to in 2. og 3., and the internationalisation process gives rise to an increasing number of situations where language and culture are separated.

Culture as contained in the semantics and pragmatics of language

Any natural language develops as part of the social practice of a community of language users. The community may be of different sizes, from e.g. a family to an international network of researchers within a certain field. The community is built up around a social structure and will to a greater or lesser extent be characterized by a common frame of reference and common norms and values. The social structure, as well as frames of reference, norms and values, mark language in its semantics, especially in the lexis, and in its pragmatics, the rules for the use of language in its social and situational context.

Thus language carries a whole range of cultural information and interpretation with it, and the theoretical understanding of language has to take account of this cultural side. In this case the phrase "language and culture are connected" is descriptively correct; probably any modern theory of language would subscribe to this, irrespective of differing conceptions of language and culture.

---

[1] The following section contains a slightly revised version of Risager 1996a (in Danish).

But in the real life of language teaching, learners typically use the foreign language without any awareness of the cultural side of language, especially in the initial phases of teaching. It cannot be avoided that the foreign language is used initially rather as a code, an amputated language, whose semantics and pragmatics is carried over from the learners' mother tongue. In this case the phrase "language and culture are connected" has the status of a normative utterance, a claim that the teaching should develop learners' awareness that the semantic system and the rules of language use are not identical with those of the mother tongue, and that the learners' foreign language (their "interlanguage") should aim at - but not necessarily attain - the authentic language with its specific semantic and pragmatic system.

A language used as a lingua franca is in a peculiar situation. It points back to its cultural origin (e.g. English in the USA), and at the same time it is the expression of in internationalised form of culture (e.g. a cross-national youth culture using English). On the one hand interlocutors have to build on the semantics and pragmatics of the language in question, including the cultural connotations that it carries with it. But on top of this, they may be able to negotiate a more local or ad hoc usage of the language, that suits them better, and is perhaps more in accordance with the semantics and pragmatics of their own languages. Fewer forms of politeness may be used, or another system of pauses may be agreed on. Thus a language used as a lingua franca is not culturally neutral, but its semantics and pragmatics (as well as its grammar and phonology) are typically influenced by the mother tongue of (one of) the interlocutors, or by other languages that they speak.

Culture as context for language use

Language typically develops and is codified in a broader cultural and historical context, e.g. within the frame of a nation-state. But of course it can be used outside this context, when e.g. French is used by French people living in Denmark. In this case the language has been taken out of its original cultural context and put to use in another cultural context; it has been recontextualised. It is still used approximately with its native semantics and pragmatics, but it has been transplanted to a context which is not native. In this case, the phrase "language and culture are connected" is not descriptively correct; you can in fact separate language and culture. With the increasing internationalisation - migration, tourism, culture export, cross-cultural cooperation - languages are more and more often recontextualised. And when languages are used in the foreign language classroom, they are naturally recontextualised.

On the other hand there is a tradition in foreign language teaching to prefer language use to be demonstrated and trained with reference to the native context. Manuals and other materials typically make communication between interlocutors take place in a country where the language is spoken as a first language, so that learners can get a broader impression of the context of the setting. Thus the phrase "language and culture are connected" may be understood as a normative didactic principle of preferring language use as it is carried out in a native context. This is also the reason why preferred destinations for study visits and exchanges are the countries where the language is spoken as a mother tongue, and for this purpose methods inspired from ethnographic studies are being developed in order to teach learners to study the here-and-now context of verbal communication. This principle, however, is losing in importance, as will become clear below from the discussion of the project on language teachers.

Culture as thematic content in language teaching

In principle, a language can express any thematic content (on the assumption that this can be verbalised at all). There is no necessary connection between the language you use, and the thematic content you speak about. In this respect the phrase "language and culture are connected" is false[2].

But general language teaching has been characterized for many years by a double aim: to learn the language, and to learn about the countries where the language in question in spoken. Thus thematic content having to do with culture and society in precisely those countries has been chosen (focusing on the central countries: Britain/USA, Germany, France, etc.), in preference to e.g. cross-cultural issues, or subjects

[2] Another problem is that a subject may have to be expressed differently in different cultural settings, because of differences in relevance structure and local rhetoric.

related to other disciplines such as biology or technology. In this case the phrase "language and culture are connected" is a normative didactic claim that texts used in foreign language teaching should concentrate on and reflect institutions, history, literature, and ways of living in those countries, and often this claim has been associated with basic educational ideas of giving pupils insight into the national cultures of these countries.

This specification of the content of language teaching, which dates back to the last century, is no longer universally claimed as the only criterion of relevance. It may be said that the national era of language teaching is coming to an end. We are currently experiencing a development towards greater separation or dissociation between language and culture than has hitherto been usual in foreign language teaching.

An important tendency is that language teaching is moving in an intercultural direction, based on the belief that learners by working with foreign cultures may become more aware of their own cultural background, and that it may be a good idea that learners read and produce foreign language texts that deal with their own culture, e.g. Denmark. In this respect Danish culture and society constitute the thematic content of foreign language texts.

There is also a tendency that teachers are sometimes loosening the ties to the target language countries, studying cross-cultural issues or such general issues as human rights or the environment, and perhaps including translated literature from other countries.

Very important trends are also the current patterns of study visits and exchanges, as well as the patterns of e-mail correspondence, and, connected with that, the practice of cross-curricular cooperation, using the language in question as a medium of instruction in other subjects. I will focus on these trends below.

A national or a universalistic criterion of relevance?

As can be understood, language teachers are faced with a complex situation. They have to define their position between two extremes. Is it preferable to maintain the greatest possible connection between language and culture, i.e. at all the three levels? That would mean that in the teaching of French, for instance, French native teachers would always be prefered, language acquisition in the native context - a francophone country - would always be preferred, and texts and activities dealing with the culture and society of the francophone countries would always be preferred. Such a position is based on a national criterion of relevance.

Or is it preferable to allow a maximum of spreading, only maintaining the necessary connection between language and culture that we find at the first level (culture as contained in the semantics and pragmatics of language)? That would mean that in the teaching of French, learners would be invited to communicate with anyone all over the world, as long as they communicate in French, and allow them to communicate on any subject. This position, which is of course only permissible if the subject matter is chosen in accordance with general educational aims, is based on a more universalistic criterion of relevance, a criterion which is perhaps more in keeping with current processes of internationalisation.

In what follows, I will explain how Danish and English foreign language teachers have gone about this issue in their teaching practices.

The experience of Danish and English teachers regarding study visits and exchanges

The interviews of the above-mentioned project dealt at several points with the question whether the interviewee thought that it was the role of the language teacher to help pupils to get personal contacts abroad. The overall answer was certainly affirmative, but there were important differences concerning which countries were referred to. Teachers in England were referring chiefly to the big European countries where the language is spoken as a first language, whereas for Danish teachers it was a very broad range of contacts covering all of Europe.

Nearly all the English teachers interviewed (18) had had experience of pupil exchanges to target language countries, exclusively the big central countries: France, Germany, Spain, and Russia. Many state that they have tried to establish pen friend contact to target language countries, but also stress difficulties with this. A few mention opportunities related to the use of guest teachers and other visitors from target

language countries.

But none of the English teachers had had experience of exchanges or other kinds of visits to or correspondence with non-target language countries, that is countries where the target language is not the first language, but a foreign language. Most of them had a positive attitude towards the idea of establishing such contacts, but often stressed that it seemed unrealistic or overwhelming to arrange visits to such countries, and as it is generally a big job to arrange visits, the teachers are forced to prioritize (central) target language countries.

The majority of the Danish teachers interviewed (43) state that they, or their school, have had exerience of study visits or pupil exchanges, whether these were aimed at target language countries or not. The teachers mention a very large number of different European countries: besides Germany (mentioned 16 times), England/Britain (16), and France (8), they mention the following countries: Poland (5), Czechoslovakia/The Czech Republic (5), Austria (3), Sweden (3), Sovjet Union/Russia (3), Norway (2), Belgium (2), Finland (2), Latvia (1), Spain (1), Greece (1), Hungary (1), Italy (1), "the Baltic countries" (1). And the following countries are mentioned in connection with pen friend or e-mail correspondance: Holland, Hungary, Latvia, Czechia, Norway, Sweden, Iceland, Germany, Lithuania, Spain, and the USA. Several teachers mention the use of guest teachers from various countries, including non-target language countries.

Several Danish teachers stress that there are pedagogical advantages in having contacts with countries where the language is not spoken as a mother tongue. In that case pupils are more on an equal footing as regards language proficiency. None of the teachers directly describe contact with such countries as unrealistic or overwhelming, but one teacher explains that current demands made on language teachers, among other things demands concerning exchanges, are so great that competent teachers tend to seek jobs outside school.

For and against visits to non-target language countries

I will cite some typical statements by Danish and English teachers concerning the overall issue. First a Danish teacher who thinks that it is important for pupils to get contacts with young people in other countries, irrespective of language:

> *"I think it's very important that pupils have or get contacts to especially young people of their own age from other language communities. It's not so important whether it is a community where the language is taught, or whether it is the actual language community that we teach about. Our school has had exchange travel to Prague for some years. Here pupils can make acquaintance with a language community they don't know otherwise, and with a cultural background that may be valuable for them to get into contact with, which is an opportunity they seldom thi ık about. In that case we chiefly use English and German as languages of communication, of course . . "* (DK 261, a man in his 40s.)

English teachers are often ambivalent in discussing possibilities of creating contacts with non-target language countries. Typically they feel a great distance between ideals and reality, e.g.

> *"As for making links with other countries, that you know, for example, a link with Denmark, I'm afraid that - yes, I would do it if I had all the time in the world and I didn't have a syllabus to follow, cos I agree that it's educationally valuable but it doesn't feed directly into a French teaching and learning programme. The only way it might do and it could be an interesting avenue to explore is why not link up with a class learning French in Czechoslovakia or a class learning French in Denmark .. but I wouldn't do it at the expense of a link with France or a link with Germany."* (UK 166, male).

Why this difference? In what follows, I shall discuss some explanations:

-The institutional structure of the two educational systems

Primary and secondary education in Denmark is provided by two kinds of institutions: first the "Folkeskole", covering primary and lower secondary education for children from 6 to 16: 9 forms plus a 10th which is optional, and next the "Gymnasium" (and similar schools which are more vocationally

orientated), covering upper secondary education for young people from 16 to 19. Foreign language teaching is delivered from age 10 to 19, and thus covers both kinds of institutions. Therefore many Danish pupils have the opportunity to participate in study visits abroad twice in the course of their (language) studies, both in the Folkeskole (particularly in the 10th form, where the financial opportunities are fairly good), and in the Gymnasium. In Britain the major break is between primary school, where there is normally no foreign language teaching, and secondary school, and normally pupils are given only one opportunity for a study visit related to the language they study; and in that case visits to target language countries are prioritized.

- Teacher education in the two countries

Teacher education for the Danish Folkeskole is a combination of general and specialized studies. Study takes place at teacher training colleges especially aiming at the Folkeskole, and future teachers study a range of basic school subjects, followed by specialized studies of two subjects of their own choice, including e.g. one or two foreign languages. Formally they are qualified to teach any subject and at all class levels, but in practice the range of teaching is focused on a smaller number of subjects. In general, language teachers teach other subjects beside language, and for this reason they normally do not specifically identity themselves as "language teachers".

British teachers in secondary school have accomplished a specialized study of their foreign language(s) at the university, including a year abroad in a target language country. (It should be noted that teachers in the Danish Gymnasium (upper secondary) are also university graduates).

- Pedagogical opportunities and priorities in the two school systems

Teachers in a Danish Folkeskole are not divided in different departments as teachers are in an English secondary school. There are of course groupings of teachers of various subjects, but typically they only gather when there is a need for it. This structure allows many contacts across disciplines, and is a basis for cross-curricular activities in teaching.

Moreover Danish teachers have what is called "freedom of method", a principle which gives them an important freedom of action as regards the choice of topics, texts, methods, and forms of study, as long as they meet the requirements set up in the official guidelines. Thus Folkeskole teachers may choose to spend some time with studies related to visits and exchanges, if this is considered to enhance the social atmosphere in the class, or further motivation and interest for school work in general. It should be added that tests are not used very often.

Language teachers in the Danish Folkeskole tend to accept easily that there may be important pedagogical reasons for traveling to other countries than target language countries. Pupils' personal and social development are valued highly, and teachers try to create situations where the self-confidence of pupils is strengthened. Therefore they may find it very suitable to present pupils with situations where they have a language proficiency comparable with or better than that of the interlocutor. This goes for pen friend and e-mail correspondence as well.

This is a typical statement from a Danish language teacher:

> *"As a matter of fact it is natural to have correpondence with Dutch children, because they are the same age, and their proficiency in English is at the same level. I think this kind of thing ought to be formalised. It might also help to create some international cooperation"* (DK 348, a woman in her 30's).

In the newly revised official guidelines for the teaching of English, German and French in the Folkeskole, it is stated that pupils should have contact with non-target language countries, so that they can experience the language when it is used as a language of international communication (lingua franca). (Engelsk 1995, Tysk 1995, Fransk 1995).

English language teachers are reserved as regards visits to non-target language countries for various

reasons. This is a typical statement:

> *"I don't think it is realistic to think that language teachers will have the time or the inclination to move beyond their own language that they're teaching"* (UK 300, male).

Some stress the role of exams:

> *"The strongest argument in favour of taking children abroad is that is has a knock-on effect on their education. If you can't prove that, then you are not going to be able to do that.* (Question: You might find that Slovakia or Hungary are places where German is the first foreign language. Would you as a German teacher find it possible to justify a link?) *No, no not for my students though because at the end of the day I've got to work towards an exam. I've got to give them what is going to benefit them most in their education, and when I'm talking about education, I'm talking about exam courses."* (UK 107).

One of the more enthusiastic teachers, who is also "coordinator for European awareness", gives the following answer:

> *"I would love to take a trip to somewhere like Hungary or Romania. I really would like to go there and see . . what the poor place is really like. Not the best place to go but perhaps Hungary but um or Bulgaria, I mean Russia, anywhere in Russia if they are learning German."* (UK 173, female).

- English as (first) foreign language in Denmark, vs. English as mother tongue in Britain

Danish teachers mention the great avantage they have because of the wide use of English, which offers possibilities for contacts in most schools around Europe:

> *"English is taught in all European countries as the first foreign language. And that is a good thing. If you go to Italy e.g. and speak English with an Italian. I mean it is better that a Dane and an Italian speak English than that they cannot communicate altogether. And I think that is a good thing. And maybe when a Dane has been in Italy for three weeks speaking English, then he might have learnt so much Italian that he says: "That would be interesting to learn". Then they would learn other languages as well."* (DK 323, a woman in her 50's).

It is evident that it is of great significance for the differences between the situations of the Danish and English language teachers that English is the first foreign language taught in Denmark - as well as in so many other countries.

- The geographical position of the two countries

Denmark is situated quite centrally in Europe, with short distances to the rest of Scandinavia and Eastern and Central Europe, and the psychological distance to Southern Europe is not great either, as there has been and is extensive tourism from Denmark to Southern Europe. Thus Denmark is placed amindst a circle of bigger and smaller countries that are relatively accessible. As Denmark is a genuine island realm, the idea of crossing water does not constitute a psychological barrier.

Britain is situated in the Western fringe of Europe, and there is for a number of historical reasons quite a big psychological distance to the continent. The idea of crossing the Channel is traditionally a barrier. Britain is both politically and culturally split between looking towards the US and Commonwealth, and looking towards Europe. Generally, Europe is identified with the Continent. This is perhaps changing nowadays, as for instance answers from our English teachers indicate.

– The pattern of exchanges throughout Europe

The big countries, Britain, Germany and France, have already formed a tradition of mutual exchanges, and there is less interest from their side in exchanging with smaller countries such as Denmark. On the other hand, Denmark has better opportunities for developing alternative exchange patterns with smaller countries, Finland, Holland, Greece, etc., and this development means an extended use of the target language as lingua franca, not least English.

Cross-curricular cooperation in connection with visits and correspondence

The school visit and maybe the exchange visit are often used to gain insights and train capabilities that cannot be reduced to just one subject. The visit may turn into a laboratory for cross-curricular cooperation where pupils work in a more problem orientated way. None of our teachers, however, mention this opportunity spontaneously in connection with the visits they talk about.

But talking about experiences with the use of electronic mail, where pupils are connected in cross-national school networks using a particular language, several Danish teachers mention that the subject area chosen may incorporate other school subjects than language, e.g. environmental issues:

> *"As a teacher of English I have always taken care that my classes have got pupils to correspond with in other countries. And I have both had a class corresponding with Holland, and they took part in an air pollution project, where they corresponded with Hungary and with Latvia. And as a matter of fact, the class I have today, that's an 8th form (ages 14/15, KR), they got a letter correspondence started already in the 5th form . . . . . if it's an English girl or boy they are going to correspond with in the 5th form, then they (the English) would know the language, and then they (my pupils) would immediately feel inferior. But the fact that they receive letters that are written in a language just as helpless as their own makes them less anxious about writing."* (DK 8, a woman in her 40s.)

Another example of a school network involving a non-language subject, is e.g. geography:

> *"For the moment my German class participates, via contacts to England, in a computer programme with an English class that studies German at beginners level. They are supposed to send messages - by way of diskette or modem - on what information they want on Denmark in the German language. Correspondingly, we send them messages about what we would like to know about them and their area. As you see, this is a data base relation. And it is clear that this kind of communication offers more than the oldfashioned geography lessons. It is an experiment we have, and of course it is to be extended to other countries."* (DK 520, a man in his 50s.)

Materials on European countries

Contacts to non target language countries create needs for suitable materials on different countries in the languages taught, and possibly adapted to classroom use. Such materials are not easily accessible. One Danish teacher makes a general statement about this new challenge for foreign language teaching:

> *"Now that we are to be tied more together in Europe, we might equally introduce the other European countries in language teaching, more specifically than it is done today. . . It is quite evident that the majority of the materials we have deal with . . I mean English materials deal with English-speaking areas etc. But considering that we are not all taught Portuguese or Spanish in school, one might easily imagine that materials in English or German were developed that dealt more in depth with the culture of these other countries."* (DK 348, a woman in her 30s).

Changes in the European language map

Will the ever more extended use of English throughout Europe have as a consequence that it will become more difficult to accomplish visits to non-target languages using other languages, like German and French? Some teachers of German state that it is a problem for their teaching that English is displacing German as preferred foreign language in eastern Europe:

> *"We were in Poland, and we experienced that they were not so eager to speak German. The older generation, that was taught German in their youth, are not so fond of it. And I think that we experienced the same thing in Czechoslovakia. But the young people, they were enormously fond of speaking English. So I think that English is our most important language when it comes to giving people opportunities to meet. Also because those things from the war do not interfere. I think we have to concentrate most on English."* (DK 323, a woman in her 50s).

Discussion of the role of language teachers concerning language policy

In relation to the above-mentioned distinction between a national and a universalistic criterion of relevance, we can see that language teachers in England work almost exclusively with a national criterion of relevance, whether voluntarily or forced by circumstances. They clearly prioritize contacts to target language countries, i.e. the native context of language use, and seem to think only in terms of the culture and civilisation of target language countries, to the exclusion of other subject areas. At any rate none of the interviewees mention instances of cross-curricular cooperation in connection with contacts abroad.

Thus language teaching in England would not normally give pupils experience with other European countries than the big ones, and through that practice, foreign languages cannot avoid transmitting a rather narrow perspective of what "Europe" is. Pupils do not normally get the chance to use their target language as a lingua franca with people who have other mother tongues, and they do not experience contexts where other languages than their target language are also spoken. They do not experience linguistic diversity (at the European level, whereas they may do so at the national level in Britain).

Danish teachers sometimes approach a universalistic criterion of relevance, prompted by various factors related to the educational system, and by the country's general international orientation, being a small country. Thus teachers are involved in contacts with both target language and non-target language countries, and their pupils may get experience of the language used as a lingua franca. Teachers consider this to be an advantage both for purely professional reasons (the development of linguistic proficiency) and for broader personal and social reasons. It should be stressed that this does not mean that the teaching in general is oriented towards a universalistic criterion of relevance; most of the materials used in classrooms deal with target countries, especially those in German and French. It should also be noted that language teaching at the Gymnasium level in Denmark is probably more similar to the English model. But the point is that Danish pupils are exposed to both approaches during their school career.

The practice of Danish language teachers as regards the use of the target language as a lingua franca in non-native contexts has consequences at two levels. With regard to the target language, the self-confidence of pupils may be furthered by the simple fact that they communicate with non-natives, who are not themselves specialists in the language. At the same time they experience that their partners (if it is an exchange visit) and their families use the target language in their own way, which may enhance pupils' tolerance of different usages, pronunciations etc. They may feel a greater autonomy in being able to negotiate with others about how the language is to be used, the others not having a native speaker monolopy. On the other hand, pupils may also get the impression that as long as they make themselves understood, problems of correctness are not that important. This is a problem connected to oral communication during visits, but not when pupils correspond by way of electronic mail, in which case they are normally more aware of the need for precise and formally correct language.

With regard to the "local" language spoken in the country or area, pupils experience this language both in its spoken and written form, although they do not understand it. In any case, this is a contribution to their awareness of languages in Europe. On the other hand it is probable that language teachers do not feel responsible for giving pupils an elementary knowledge of the local language, how it is related to other languages, how many speakers there are, whether it is taught in school, etc. In this sense the local language is "invisible" in the teaching, particularly when pupils communicate by way of electronic mail,

in which case the local language is simply not on the screen.

At any rate, none of the teachers that we interviewed mentioned the possibility of giving this sort of information. The interpretation may be that language teachers are traditionally responsible for "their" language(s). Knowledge about other languages is normally not covered during their training. But with internationalization, this monolinguistic identity may be challenged. In any case, one might suggest that materials about the different countries or regions in Europe, used in classrooms, should include some information on the languages spoken in the area, so that teachers and pupils become aware of this aspect.

Because of the stronger tendency in the Danish Folkeskole for teachers to engage in cross-curricular activities, pupils may moreover experience that their foreign language can be used as a medium for work with many different topics and school subjects.

The language policy of Danish language teachers is based upon the possible separation of language and culture, in the two respects that were discussed above: when culture is understood as the context for language use, and when culture is understood as the thematic content of language teaching. Maybe this orientation also furthers the false view that a language like English is culturally neutral when used as a lingua franca, a view that is quite widespread in Denmark.

In conclusion, it can be said that in these years of increasing integration in Europe, language teachers in England do not have the same basis for furthering pupils' awareness of European linguistic diversity that Danish teachers have - and to varying extents language teachers in most of the other European countries. In this respect it may be said to be a definite disadvantage for pupils to have English as their first (or official) language.

References

Engelsk. Faghæfte 2. The Ministry of Education, Copenhagen, 1995.

Fransk. Faghæfte 18. The Ministry of Education, Copenhagen, 1995.

Risager, Karen 1995: Language Teachers' Identity and the Process of European Integration. in: Jensen, Jaeger, Lorentsen (eds): *Intercultural Competence*, Vol. II, Aalborg University Press, pp. 251-262.

Risager, Karen 1996a: Hænger sprog og kultur nu også sammen? in: *Sprogforum*, special issue, The Royal Danish School of Eduational Studies, Copenhagen (in press).

Risager, Karen 1996b: Language Teaching and the Process of European Integration. in: Byram and Fleming (eds.): *Foreign Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective*. Cambridge University Press (in press).

Tysk. Faghæfte 17. The Ministry of Education, Copenhagen, 1995

Subcultural identities: English-Danish grassroots bilingualism

Bent Preisler

Code-switching to English is becoming increasingly common in countries where English is only a foreign language, as reflected especially in the media and advertising. In Denmark, a general proficiency in English is taken for granted to the extent that many imported texts such as international ads and instruction manuals accompanying foreign products etc. are not translated at all. Even some Danish ads shown in Denmark are in English to give them an international flavor. This development is inspired in particular by the growing influence of various internationally-oriented youth subcultures (computers, hip-hop, etc). At the same time it completely ignores the language problems of the older and/or less educated sections of the population.

This paper is a progress report on one aspect of a large-scale project, supported by the Danish Research Council for the Humanities, on the use of English in everyday life in Denmark, and on attitudes and problems related to this. The project consists of two complementary investigations: (1) a quantitative analysis of responses to a large questionnaire given to a random sample of the Danish adult population, and (2) a qualitative discourse analysis of ethnographic interviews with representatives of some of the youth subcultures assumed to be spearheading the use of English in Denmark.

It is the latter component which provides the topic of this paper. Extensive interviews have been carried out with central members of subcultural groups relying heavily on the use of English, who refer to their subcultural form of expression as (1) *rock music*, (2) *death metal music*, (3) *hip-hop dancing* and *grafiti*, and (4) *computers*. An adult subculture similarly dependent on the use of English has been included for comparison, viz. (5) *short-wave radio*. Subcultures such as these are seen as important agents in the spontaneous promotion of English in Denmark, and the qualitative interview seeks to identify the processes defining this role.

These processes can only be understood on the basis of a general subcultural theory (Høgsbro, 1995; cf. Corbin & Strauss, 1990):

1. A subculture is defined, across time and place, in terms of members' shared paradigms of meaning. It is a variant of a mother culture or combines elements of meaning from different mother cultures. Elements of meaning differentiating one subculture from another are marked by symbols. The pattern of symbols constitutes the style of the subculture, through which it appears as a separate social organization.

2. Members' status in the subculture is not dependent on their qualities as individuals, but only on the degree in which they have been able to internalize the subcultural paradigms of meaning, as these are symbolized in style of living, patterns of social behavior, style of language, body language and dress.

3. The core of the subculture consists of those who have internalized the subcultural paradigms of meaning. Around this core there is a zone of members who master these paradigms to a varying degree, and whose less perfect mastery may to some extent be compensated for by a show of style. As this show of style determines a member's position in the hierarchy, it leads to the development of a "public" vs. a "private" self, as well as anxiety-and-bluff mechanisms to avoid revelation of the private self because it constitutes a potential threat to one's status.

4. For the same reason, the mythology of the subculture is not about the lives of individuals, but about a chain of collective conquests vis-a-vis a hegemonic culture or other subcultures.

5. The subculture as a form of social organization pervades all social strata and social movements. Because of the personal anonymity of its members, their independence of family and local values, it is the most important political and cultural contributor to the democratic processes through which social institutions are continuously being revised and transformed.

How does this understanding of *subcultural* processes help clarify the processes through which *English* is introduced into Danish everyday life? Let's look at the hypotheses again in this light:

(1) The subcultures under investigation are all variants of a mother culture which is international, rooted in the English-speaking world. The symbols of meaning whereby the subculture acquires its identity are therefore first of all linguistic ones, the use of codeswitching to English in the subcultural discourse.

English, furthermore, is a necessary medium of communication with groups belonging to the same subculture in other countries. By themselves, the national groups would hardly survive. They exist only by virtue of belonging to a subculture which is international.

These features are borne out by the interviews. Core members spend a lot of time and money on direct communication with, and visits to, groups in other countries.

(2) As members' status in the subcultural hierarchy depends on their ability to internalize the subcultural paradigms of meaning, symbolized by language (among other things), the ability to use and understand English must obviously be an important status symbol.

(3) In the subcultures investigated this is confirmed in so far as core members are either fluent in English, or at least seem to have the whole range of relevant and distinctive English terminology at their fingertips. More marginal members, in this case members who by their own admission are less involved in the subculture, appear to be less inclined to codeswitch. Significantly, we are talking here about female members. In other words, there are grounds for believing that the conflict between an individual's public and private self, resulting from competition and anxiety about status within the group, leading to compensatory preoccupation with the style (including linguistic style) of the subculture, is primarily a male phenomenon.

(4) Theory no. 4 seems to differentiate between the youth subcultures, on the one hand, and the one middle-age subculture investigated (radio amateurs), on the other. Whereas the radio amateurs do not see themselves as being in opposition to the establishment, members of the youth cultures are obviously used to having to defend themselves vis-a-vis the hegemonic culture, which they do with indirect reference to the collective conquests of the subculture. The death metal singer, conscious of the violence and aggressiveness of his music, talks with pride about the radio program in which his death metal singing technique, called "growling", received remarks of approval by an established opera singer. The hip-hop street dancers have performed on television, and one member, who is also a grafiti artist, has had a picture exhibited at a recognized art exhibition. A computer-culture informant admits that his subculture depends on the illegal copying of software, but still his knowledge of computers has landed him a job at a school, installing computers, i.e. his subculture still provides access to increased status in the hegemonic culture.

(5) Stories such as these, at the micro-level, suggest that the subculture is indeed an important contributor to the processes through which popular cultural demands lead to the gradual revision of social institutions. At the macro level, it would be natural to see the huge amount of codeswitching to English in all sorts of media texts (especially advertising) addressed to young people as a most conspicuous manifestation of a collective conquest on the part of the many youth subcultures where the use of English is a status symbol.

The single most striking feature emerging at this stage in the investigation pertains to the question of gender: not only do female members constitute a very small minority, the few females are also *marginal* members. Typically, a female member will explain that she joined the group because her boy friend (or in the case of the radio amateurs, her husband) was a member. The subcultures under investigation, therefore, are dominated by men, and so is their contribution toward the increasing use of codeswitching to English.

As it happens, this hypothesis is in agreement with recent theories of how gender-typed interactional patterns evolve in pre-adolescent peer groups (see e.g. Preisler, 1994): Pre-adolescent boys' groups find their role models in male subcultures that are nonprestigious in the hegemonic culture. Pre-adolescent boys' groups, furthermore, are competitive and effective at enforcing group norms (including speech norms), as opposed to publicly endorsed norms. The relationships of pre-adolescent *girls*, on the other hand, are non-competitive and not conducive to norm-enforcement. I suggest it makes a lot of sense to regard the male dominated subculture, at the level of the individual group, as essentially a continuation of the pre-adolescent boys' group in terms of structure, interactional patterns, and norm-enforcement. Viewed in this light, the increase in the use of codeswitching to English is but a particular manifestation of laws that seem to apply generally to language change: language change away from the standard (in this case, away from the consis-

tent use of standard Danish) is usually spearheaded by men.

And as with language change generally, this particular change, resulting from sociolinguistic forces within the subculture-defined-as-speech-community, is hardly susceptible to regulation by the hegemonic culture — even if regulation were called for. However, the codeswitching which it inspires or justifies in public communication, above all in advertising, might well reach proportions where it would amount to discrimination against those who don't understand English very well or at all. In that case it might be necessary to enforce some rules specifying the maximum percentage of sentences in a foreign language that it would be acceptable for a Danish text aimed at a general public to contain.

But even this would not bridge the ever-widening gap between what is by now probably a majority of the population who are becoming absolutely fluent in English (at least in terms of passive proficiency), and a large minority who have not been able to follow suit, who are therefore lagging more and more behind, and who do not want to admit that they suffer from a new kind of functional illiteracy. To help people such as these, nothing short of a major adult-language-teaching campaign is needed. This might well be one of the recommendations of this research project.

References:

Høgsbro, K. (1995). Arbejdspapir vedrørende de metodiske forudsætninger for analysen af subkulturers brug af talemåder og begreber fra det engelske sprog. Unpublished working paper.

Preisler, B. (1994). Empirical findings and interpretation in language and gender research. To appear in *Nordlyd* (Tromsø University Working Papers on Language and Linguistics).

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park etc.: Sage.

Sociopolitical factors and languages of scientific communication

Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas

Conseil de la langue française, Québec
Colloque "Le français et les langues scientifiques de demain"
19 - 21 mars 1996, Montréal

There is abundant evidence of language shift in scientific communication into English from other languages. There is anecdotal evidence of non-native speakers of English resenting being obliged to use English in all or most of their scientific communication, but in general this process seems to be internalized as part of an inevitable, and possibly natural and even voluntary process. Individuals who wish to be part of the scientific community in a given field are encouraged or coerced into writing their doctoral theses or scientific articles in the "international" language. Editors of scientific journals, and research councils therefore influence language policy through their gate-keeping[1]. A range of scientific traditions (Gallic, Nipponic, Teutonic,...) are subject to pressure from supranational ones which appear to be above "national" policies.

It is important to explore how such instrumental language shift is related to wider processes of Europeanization, Americanization and **globalization** (which McDonaldization in the media and pop culture prominently symbolizes). Changes in scientific communication occur in tandem with technological change, and concurrent commercial and political shifts. There are changes in types and means of communication that are subtle, complex and fluid. Neither the underlying processes nor the interests these serve are readily or easily perceptible.

Asymmetry in North-South relations

Before considering relationships between scholars in various states in the rich "North", it is useful to consider **North-South relations**. There is hard evidence of a gross mismatch between the types of scientific activity undertaken in postcolonial societies and urgent social needs. The brain drain is symptomatic of asymmetrical North-South relations: scholars from the South are trained to function in the North (both geographically and ideologically) rather than the South. In the development "aid" business, with the World Bank now in the lead, North governments have been very willing over the past 40 years to position scientists from the North strategically throughout the South. There is a relatively clear-cut picture of scientific imperialism, interlocking with educational and cultural imperialism, in global relations of dominance (Galtung 1980). The global hierarchy also has a linguistic dimension, with structural elements, material resources, and ideologies that underpin it.

An understanding of how and why this has happened presupposes familiarity with colonial language policy (Calvet 1974), and an understanding of how the hierarchy of languages in virtually all former colonies has not merely remained intact but actually been strengthened (Mateene 1985). This is substantially due to education systems and language policy in development reflecting western thinking, and this suiting elites in the South[2] (Phillipson 1992). Broadly speaking, development has assisted the **dominant** languages, i.e. the former colonial languages. Most "aid" to education has served this purpose. Hardly any has been directly aimed at supporting local languages.

That scholars in the South have internalized North paradigms and values can be seen ubiquitously:

> "Africans have been psychologically conditioned to believe that only European languages are structured to aid development." Mubanga Kashoki, in UNIN 1981, 41.

A study of scholarly articles in the journal "Indian Linguistics" over a ten-year period (Sharada 1985) reveals that those texts cited most frequently are from the US, and "contemporary Indian authors seldom cite one another" (ibid., 31). The position is comparable in the field of sociology, psychology, and doubtless many others[3]. The Western sources referred to are often of dubious relevance, but are functional

in perpetuating dependence on the North, and its languages.

Such findings are not surprising, since the historical record shows that **American government funds** and **"philanthropic" foundations** have been active throughout this century, but particularly in a seminal period following 1945, in establishing paradigms of scientific activity and professional infrastructure worldwide that would conform to American models and interests[4].

Thus development assistance has been instrumental in effectuating linguistic imperialism, and been very functional in maintaining the dominance of European languages in former colonies[5]. **Linguistic imperialism** occurs worldwide, e.g. in the Pacific and Australasia:

> Linguistic imperialism is the expansion of a small number of languages at the cost of a large number of others. Linguistic imperialism is a promoter of one-way learning, the flow of knowledge and information from the powerful to the powerless. (Mühlhäusler 1994, 122).

Part of the ideological underpinning of this dominance is embedded in such labels as "international" or "world" language. These concepts are hierarchical in that other languages are by implication stigmatized as inferior and less useful. An apparently neutral ascription presupposes that its users share a commonality of interest, whereas globalization and development processes not only affect the North and the South differentially, they also impact on people differentially, favouring men rather than women, for instance, in schooling and literacy skills (Skutnabb-Kangas 1994). They also serve particular interests, mainly those essential to the economy and social reproduction. This pattern holds not only in North-South relations: within North countries, dominated (marginalized) areas and groups are affected in similar ways (Jussila & Segerståhl 1988).

Englishization in Danish scientific communication

In order to shed light on some of these processes, and how they are perceived in a "marginal" North country, we are conducting a pilot study of the use our colleagues at the University of Roskilde make of languages of scientific communication, of their experience of Englishization, and the possible consequences for Danish as a language of scientific communication.

A few words initially about the **context**. English is increasingly used in higher education in Denmark. Students of virtually all subjects are expected to read books and journals in English. Scandinavian scholarly journals aiming at the international public use English. Some departments are shifting to using English as the medium of education, at least partially. Policy is decided on by the institution in question, and is not guided by any explicit national policy. The funds provided by the European Union for increased student and staff mobility have accelerated the trend towards a greater use of English, even when some of the funds nominally (e.g. LINGUA) are intended to support the "smaller" European languages.

There is no institution in Denmark concerned with language policy, other than a small body with responsibility for **corpus planning** for Danish. This advises the general public on matters of spelling, lexical innovations and correctness and the like. It explicitly eschews **language status** policy, although several members of this committee (who are almost invariably specialists in Danish language) are aware that the increased use of English in particular domains (in business, the media, academic life, etc) may represent a curtailment of Danish[6]. There is a consensus that proficiency in foreign languages is essential for Denmark, for commercial, political and cultural reasons, and the learning of foreign languages in school is accorded great weight. They can be ranked roughly in order of importance: English, German, French, Spanish, others.

There is little debate in the media or professional associations about language policy, except for **language acquisition** matters, e.g. how early the teaching of English should be started in school, or how immigrants might learn Danish fast. There is no debate on whether immigrants should have the right to learn their mother tongue. Occasionally scholars express concern about language policy, as the following two examples indicate.

The editor-in-chief of a major Danish national encyclopedia has written that many contributors who are natural scientists are unable to communicate their scholarship in Danish for a Danish audience (Lund 1995). This is a familiar concern, for instance when medical doctors need to make themselves comprehensible in a non-technical way, but the widespread use of English seems to be aggravating the problem.

Secondly, a geologist has written that borrowing concepts from English into Danish, and the act of writing in English, are often a camouflage for sloppy thinking (Hansen 1996). In his view Danes delude themselves into thinking they are being precise, whereas in fact their texts demonstrate ignorance of the connotations of many English words and fail to contribute to a sound development of the Danish language.

There is nothing new about Denmark being strongly influenced by and through the languages of bigger powers. **German** influence was strong for several centuries. German was the first foreign language until the immediate post-1945 period, since which English has gradually expanded. Higher education institutions in Europe were strongly influenced by **American** funds and definitions of scientific relevance from the 1920s. A study of the expansion of the social sciences in higher education in Britain in the inter-war period reveals the decisive role of the Rockefeller foundation, which disbursed approximately twice the amount that the British funding agency, the University Grants Committee, spent (Fisher 1982, 240). Key institutions in continental Europe were courted and moulded in the same way. It is not only the French who have engaged in cultural and scientific export.

The empirical study: "Danish is not a scientific language" or "Anglo-Americans are handicapped".

In our empirical study, we preyed on the goodwill of all tenured professors and lecturers in the humanities, social and natural sciences at the university, and received 83 completed questionnaires, a very reasonable response rate (over 50 per cent). The colleagues have a rich mix of nationalities and languages, but the majority are Danes. The questionnaire itself was in English but our colleagues were free to reply in the language of their choice. A dozen chose to reply in Danish, the rest in English.

The questionnaire (see Appendix) covered
- assessments of their competence in Danish, English, French and German, and other languages,
- the languages in which they publish, and whether there is any change as compared with 10 years ago,
- perceptions of difficulty in writing in a foreign language, and whether they are assisted (translation, native speaker checking a text, etc),
- attitudes to language policy, and whether such matters are discussed,
- the language(s) used in conferences in their field,
- whether the increased use of English represents a threat to Danish,
- whether any research has remained "unnoticed" because it was written up in a Nordic language,
- how far the obligation to write in a foreign language has influenced their scientific approach.

The responses show that there is a wide range of perceptions of what is happening in the ongoing Englishization of higher education in Denmark, of what is at stake, and what the implications are.

Some Danes admit to difficulties in functioning in English:

> To me writing and speaking English represents a reduction in accuracy - and an extra workload. (53[7])

Many scholars claim the opposite, and are happy to operate in English. A fraction of these operate in other languages in addition, and feel Anglo-Americans are handicapped if they are restricted to input from and in one language.

> I really think that it is an advantage to come from a small country where one has been forced to learn languages - especially compared to the Anglosaxons. (22)

> There is no antagonism between maintaining one's cultural identity (as a Dane), and working/living in foreign cultures, speaking/writing in 2-4 languages. Rather, it enriches your life. (51)

> At Nordic conferences, English is spreading as the medium of written papers, although many speakers present them in Danish, Norwegian, Swedish. (20)

There is also a diverse picture when it comes to the actual use made of English and Danish. Some write exclusively in English, and feel Danish is not at risk, boldly reporting that "Danish is not a scientific language" and "one language is enough for science". Others feel that some research is undervalued simply

because it is written in Danish.

> The most important thing to do is to abolish the snobbery of international publications, ratings, etc. Assessment should be by quality rather than status etc. (9)

Most regard contact with scientific English as beneficial for Danish research, but some feel that conforming to the dominant language and its scientific norms involves sacrifice. Some feel that the obligation to function in a second language, in their written work and at conferences, puts them at a disadvantage vis-a-vis native speakers.

Roughly half of the informants judge that change over the past 10 years in the direction of a greater use of English has been "moderate" or "major". Virtually the same number assess that there has been "no" or "minor" change. For those for whom there is no change, the likelihood is that they are natural scientists who have always published only in English, whereas in other fields the obligation to publish in English is more recent (the same article may of course be published in more than one language). Figures for the **proportion published in Danish and English** in the period 1990-95, including those in press, are as follows, for 83 informants:

	0%	under 25%	25-50%	50-75%	75+%	100%
Danish	10	24	11	22	14	2
English	5	16	24	10	17	11

In addition there is a sprinkling of publications in other languages, some in the mother tongue of the informant (German, Swedish etc), some in translation.

Only 15 state that they publish in **French**, but invariably these scholars publish twice or three times as much in English[8]. Evidently few scholars in Denmark are geared primarily towards publishing in French, even though the vast majority had a grounding in the language at school. 68 of the 83 informants learned French for three years or longer. Thus even though certain disciplines have a strong tradition in francophonic countries, e.g. mathematics (Papon 1994), Danish scholars in this field are oriented elsewhere. We did not attempt to verify the extent to which scholars in Denmark read widely in French.

There is very little discussion in professional circles of language policy, in most subject areas none at all, and it is exclusively scholars with a professional interest in languages who are hooked on this topic.

The majority experience that there is no threat or only a minor threat to Danish, for a small number the threat is moderate, and only for 10%, nearly all of them language specialists, is the threat major. However, a substantial number are convinced that research not available in English has gone unnoticed.

Although few comment in detail on the link between the medium and scientific paradigms, this concern is also felt:

> I don't see writing in English as the problem. The problem is the strength of US research on the market, i.e. as scientific commodities (not necessarily the same as excellency in theoretical level etc.). Nobody in Scandinavia can publish without discussing on American premisses - or in relation to them. The reverse does not hold. (64)

Patterns and archetypes

Our results suggest that our informants can be grouped into three broad categories, which we label the **English-only**, the **Danish-mostly**, and the **Multilingual**.

The **English-only** group seems to consist predominantly of natural scientists and to have the following characteristics:

1. they publish in English only;
2. they often rate their linguistic competence in English as very good or excellent;
3. they feel that they have no problems whatsoever in writing in English - though to judge from some responses, competence is far from optimal, and writing in English may be "moderately" demanding;

4. they generally feel that English is the "natural" and self-evident language of science, and that Danish is not a scientific language or a language for scientific work/publication;
5. they mostly feel that Danish researchers are not at a disadvantage as compared to native speakers of English;
6. they think that there is no change in their use of languages as compared with 10 years ago, and if there is any change, it is towards more use of English - and for the good;
7. they have their English checked by native speakers only seldom, the reason being that they claim there is mostly no need;
8. they think that there is little or no need to assist researchers to become functionally multilingual, though some endorse residence abroad and special course work;
9. they see no threat from English to Danish;
10. there is no discussion about language policy in their field;
11. conferences, including Nordic ones, are generally exclusively in English, some are multilingual;
12. they are mostly not familiar with research which has gone "unnoticed" because it was written up in a Scandinavian language, and often such work is available in English after a time-lag;
13. they feel that their scientific approach has not been influenced by needing to write in English, and generally contact with English represents enrichment;
14. they are more often male than female.

The **Danish-mostly** group seems to have the following characteristics:
- they are mainly scholars in such fields as history, Danish, education, and topics which are by their nature concerned with Danish conditions or texts, or which are seen as of little interest to outsiders for other reasons, or where the researcher is oriented towards communicating results to a Danish audience (e.g. environmental studies);
- they share few of the characteristics attributed to the English-only group, though there is a tendency towards needing to be able to operate in English in publications and at conferences;
- they generally sense that the Danish language is in some ways threatened by English but tend to be resigned or pessimistic about whether this trend can be influenced or resisted, so that often there is an implicit acceptance of this "modernisation" paradigm;
- some protest against publications in Danish not being seen as of equal value as those in English, i.e that language tends to be more important than quality in evaluations and appointments;
- they is a somewhat higher percentage of females than in the other groups.

The **Multilingual** group seems to have the following characteristics:
- they are individuals from a wide range of subjects;
- they have developed their command of several languages through marriage, or emigration, or a variety of circumstances;
- though they are keenly aware of what one loses when not functioning through one's mother tongue (with its nuances, accuracy, irony, etc), they are convinced of the benefits of not being a monolingual, unlike speakers of English with no access to other cultures and scientific traditions;
- they express more appreciation of multilingualism in many contexts, e.g. at conferences;
- they often have ideas on how to manage change, in practices and attitudes, but often only at the level of the individual;
- they are aware of shifts of paradigm in their scientific approach through an increased use of English, and some are critical of native English speakers at conferences, and American dominance in general.

Asymmetry in North-North relations

The results of our modest pilot study demonstrate that multilingualism is entrenched in Danish higher education, but that the general, but by no means sole, trend is towards a strengthening of English. If the position of Danish is not to be marginalized further, and if competence in a variety of languages is to be cherished, there is a need for academic policy-makers and gate-keepers to pursue more active and more explicit language policies. Although there are very few signs that language policy is of broad concern, a

move in this direction would be in tune with recent changes in how higher education and research are managed.

Higher education research in Denmark was until recently conducted very much on *laissez faire* lines, the individual enjoying a sovereign right to select topics and methods of research. This is changing. A substantial measure of accountability is expected (for which responsibility rests with heads of departments), research time has to result in visible publications, departments formulate research plans and profiles, and the Danish state (in separate ministries of education and of research) is attempting to evaluate quality in particular subject areas. Views are divided on how far these various exercises are likely to achieve their intended effects, but there is comparable experience in Sweden and the Netherlands to build on, and a ranking system in Great Britain that is regarded as not one to imitate. At the very least, research is no longer a private matter.

Ultimately all this activity represents attempts to ensure Danish competitive skills across the board, the country's intellectual resources being the only natural resources it possesses. There is much verbal bowing to the god of "international" standards, such that Danes employed at Harvard are regarded as ideal big brother advisers.

The University of Roskilde is a small institution (6200 students) in a small country (5½ million). The experience of being able to operate in not only the "small" national language, Danish, but also in the dominant "world" language, English, is therefore a good indication of Danish needs, not only in science but also in trade and industry (Denmark boasts a few of its own transnationals and a host of small export-oriented companies), in government (now intimately locked into the embrace of the multilingual European Union), in the media (Danish national channels compete with a spectrum of transnational channels), and in many other domains. Language hierarchies are comparable in each area, and reinforce each other.

How the asymmetrical flow of knowledge to and from the dominant language, English, will evolve in the coming decades is unclear, as English is intimately linked to processes of capitalist competition and to exploitation of human resources and fragile, finite material resources, global and local. The role of language in these wider processes needs much more exploration, so that the logic and processes of current patterns and archetypes can be adequately understood, and implications for language policy identified, at supranational, national and subnational levels.

We shall conclude by making two points about our study, each of which reinforces the case for more research into the issues.

The gender differences noted in our study need to be related to other scholarly studies that can serve to generate hypotheses about trends in Englishization. Some have shown that women are linguistically conservative, and shift less than men from dialectal to standard forms or from mother tongues to second languages. Other studies show that women are more sensitive to pressures from standard languages or prestige varieties, and adopt them faster than males. Thus one hypothesis is that women might use more Danish (maintaining tradition). A contradictory hypothesis is that women might use more English (the prestige variant).

Sexism is still a prominent feature of Nordic universities, and even moderate affirmative action has been energetically opposed in all Nordic countries except Norway. There are rather few women among our informants, simply because there are fewer female permanent staff, especially in the natural sciences, and slightly less so in areas with a more local flavour. Thus even if women seem to be over-represented in the Danish-mostly group, and men seem to be leading the Englishization trend, these findings may be an artefact of the sexism that positions the two genders differently at the university. They cannot be seen as evidence of women as traditionalists.

Much of our evidence appears to conform with a **Diffusion of English paradigm** (Tsuda 1994) characterized by

A. - capitalism
B. - science and technology
C. - modernization
D. - monolingualism
E. - ideological globalization and internationalization
F. - transnationalization
G. - Americanization and homogenization of world culture
H. - linguistic, cultural and media imperialism

Much of the evidence also supports the alternative paradigm, the **Ecology of Language Paradigm**

1. - a human rights perspective
2. - equality in communication
3. - multilingualism
4. - maintenance of languages and cultures
5. - protection of national sovereignties
6. - promotion of foreign language education.

This way of conceptualizing current developments worldwide needs further study, along with the prospects for each paradigm. The particular roles played by scientific communication, and the language policy decisions that underpin each need closer scrutiny and identification. It would be important to link language use in higher education to educational language policy that effectively promotes bi- or trilingualism (Skutnabb-Kangas 1995) as a prerequisite for equitable communication.

References:

Ammon, Ulrich, Norbert Dittmar & Klaus Mattheier (Eds.) (1988). *Sociolinguistics: an international handbook of the science of language and society*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Calvet, Louis-Jean (1974). *Linguistique et colonialisme: petit traité de glottophagie*. Paris: Payot.

Galtung, Johan (1980). *The true worlds. A transnational perspective*. New York: The Free Press.

Haberland, Hartmut (1988). Research policy, in Ammon et al (Eds.), 1814-1826.

Haberland, Hartmut, Carol Henriksen, Robert Phillipson & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (1991). Tak for mad! Om sprogæderi med dansk som livret. In *Det danske sprogs status år 2001, er dansk et truet sprog?* J.Normann Jørgensen (Ed.). Copenhagen: Danmarks Lærerhøjskole, 111-138.

Hansen, Jens Morten (1996). Tal dansk din sorte hund (interview with Thomas With). *Magisterbladet* 1, 5-8.

Kanto, Antti (1996). Miksei geologiaa kirjoiteta suomeksi? (Why does one not write geology in Finnish?). *Hiidenkivi* 1, 39 (Reader's letter).

Jussila, Heikki & Segerståhl, Boris (1988). *Cultural and societal change in the North - the role of innovation in development*. Oulu: Research Institute of Northern Finland, Working Papers 56, October 1988.

Lund, Jørn (1995). Plan, program og perspektiv. *Magisterbladet*, 19, 21.

Mateene, Kahombo (1985) Colonial languages as compulsory means of domination, and indigenous languages, as necessary factors of liberation and development. In Mateene, Kalema & Chomba (Eds.), 60-69.

Mateene, Kahombo, Kalema, John and Chomba, Bernard (Eds.) (1985). *Linguistic liberation and unity of Africa*. Kampala: OAU Bureau of Languages.

Mühlhäusler, Peter (1994). Language teaching = linguistic imperialism? *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 17:2, 121-130.

Papon, Pierre (1994). La recherche en francophonie. *Universités*, 15/1, 33.

Phillipson, Robert (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, Robert & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (1995). *Papers in European language policy*. ROLIG-papir 53, Roskilde: University of Roskilde.

Phillipson, Robert & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (in press). Linguistic human rights and development, in *Ethical Dilemmas in Development Co-operation. Should there be a code of conduct for development workers?* edited by Cees J. Hamelink. Amsterdam: Dutch Association for Development & Culture.

Sachs, Wolfgang (1992). One World. In Sachs (Ed.), 102-115.

Sachs, Wolfgang (Ed.) (1992). *The development dictionary. A guide to knowledge as power*. London: Zed Books.

Sharada, B.A. (1985). Citation analysis of the journal Indian Linguistics 1971-80, *Indian Linguistics*, 46/3-4, 29-45.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1994). Language and Gender in Development. Keynote paper. In MacKenzie, John & McCaffery, Juliet (Eds.) *Language and Gender in Development. A Symposium*, Manchester: The British Council, 15-45.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (Ed.) (1995). *Multilingualism for all*, Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Tsuda, Yukio (1994). The diffusion of English: its impact on culture and communication, *Keio Communication Review*, 16, 49-61.

UNIN (United Nations Institute for Namibia) (1981). *Toward a language policy for Namibia. English as the official language: perspectives and strategies*. Lusaka: UNIN.

Notes:

1 Publicity from the Danish research councils refers to publication in "main" languages, a coded reference to English, and possibly French and German, but which excludes Danish. There is also anecdotal evidence of at least some "consumers" of scientific research in the North complaining about reduced access to information, even about their own countries, because this evidence is only availabale in English rather that the mother tongue of local consumers (reader's letter by Antti Kanto in **Hildenkivi** 1, 1996 - this is a journal published by the Research Centre for Domestic Languages in Finland and others).

2 In theory South leaders are in favour of greater use of local languages, but this remains pious rhetoric, see Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas in press.

3 Our impressions from a stay of two months in India in 1994-95 confirm this picture in psychology and linguistics.

4 For references to studies of American foundations in Europe and the "Third World", see Phillipson 1992. On the shaping of sociolinguistics, see Haberland 1988. The gentle but firm shift towards English can be seen in the activities of the Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée (AILA), which was nursed into life on French soil, with the French, British and American governments as midwives, but its world congresses, held every three years, are currently almost exclusively English-speaking.

5 In linguistic imperialism, the dominance of a given language is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between that language and other languages. Structural refers broadly to material properties (for example institutions, financial allocations) and cultural to immaterial or ideological properties (for example, attitudes and beliefs). Asymmetrical exploitation involves language learning and language use being subtractive rather than additive, for instance when competence in a dominant language entails the marginalization and loss of others (Phillipson 1992).

6 Few Danish scholars demonstrate familiarity with the language planning literature or the experience of managing multilingualism worldwide, but see Haberland et al 1991, Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1995.

7 The questionnaires returned by each informant have been numbered.

8 The sole full professor of French at the university, who is a prolific writer of books and articles in French (and also in Italian), did not return the questionnaire.

EUROLING PROJECT
Pilot study of languages of scientific communication
QUESTIONNAIRE

AGE under 30☐ 30-40 ☐ 40-50 ☐ 50-60 ☐ over 60 ☐
GENDER female ☐ male ☐
POSITION adjunkt / lektor / professor / other .....
in Institut .....

1. **Mother tongue(s)** .....

2. How many years did you study the following languages in **school**?
English ..... years
French ..... years
German ..... years
other ..... years of .....
other ..... years of .....

3. Please rate your **competence** in the following languages on a scale of 1 (excellent), 2 (very good), 3 (good), 4 (limited), 5 (poor):

	READING	WRITING	LISTENING	SPEAKING
Danish				
English				
French				
German				
other				
other				
other				
other				
other				
other				

4. **In what language(s)** have your articles and/or books in the period 1990-1995 (including those now in press) been **published**:

	under 25%	25-50%	50-75%	over 75%	100%
Danish					
English					
German					
French					
.....					
.....					

5. Indicate whether there is any **change** (for instance from Danish to English) as compared with 10 years ago:
none ☐ minor ☐ moderate ☐ major ☐
In what direction?

.....

What **reasons** are there for the change?

.....

.....

6. State how far you have more **difficulty writing in a foreign language** than in your mother tongue:
none ☐ minor ☐ moderate ☐ major ☐

7. Assuming your mother tongue is not English, French or German, and you now regularly write in one or more of these languages, in what ways **is the language checked** before the text goes to print. Write the reply separately for each language:

ENGLISH
a. someone with native speaker competence checks the language
and is ☐ / is not ☐ paid for this task
b. it is not checked by a native speaker ☐
because there is no or little need ☐
because there is no money for this purpose ☐
because native speaker correctness is not essential ☐
c. the publisher undertakes to check the language ☐

FRENCH
a. someone with native speaker competence checks the language
and is ☐ / is not ☐ paid for this task
b. it is not checked by a native speaker ☐
because there is no or little need ☐
because there is no money for this purpose ☐
because native speaker correctness is not essential ☐
c. the publisher undertakes to check the language ☐

GERMAN
a. someone with native speaker competence checks the language
and is ☐ / is not ☐ paid for this task
b. it is not checked by a native speaker ☐
because there is no or little need ☐
because there is no money for this purpose ☐
because native speaker correctness is not essential ☐
c. the publisher undertakes to check the language ☐

8. Assuming your mother tongue is not English, French or German, are your texts **translated**

from Danish into these languages, by you or by somebody else?

To English: Yes, by me ☐ Yes, by somebody else ☐ No, I write directly in English ☐
To French: Yes, by me ☐ Yes, by somebody else ☐ No, I write directly in French ☐
To German: Yes, by me ☐ Yes, by somebody else ☐ No, I write directly in German ☐

9. If translated by somebody else, **who pays** for this? .....

10. Assuming Danish researchers have to publish in languages other than Danish, is there **adequate funding** for translation or a language check? Yes ☐ No ☐

11. Who should in your view be responsible for providing the **funds for a language check?**

your Department ☐ RUC centrally ☐ a research council ☐ publishers ☐
researchers themselves ☐ someone else ☐ (please specify) .....

for translation?

your Department ☐ RUC centrally ☐ a research council ☐ publishers ☐
researchers themselves ☐ someone else ☐ (please specify) .....

12. Do you think **Danes** are in some way **at a disadvantage vis-a-vis native speakers of English** in the international scientific community? At conferences? In writing, e.g. not being referred to as often as native speakers? Not knowing British/North American-dominated networks as well as native speakers? In other ways? How?

.....
.....

13. Do you think more should be done to **assist** you and younger researchers **to be/become functionally multilingual**?

– by RUC ☐
– by the research councils, Forskerakademiet ☐
– by the European Union ☐

How?.....
.....

14. Assess how far the increased use of English represents a **threat to Danish** and its viability as a language of scientific communication:

none ☐ minor ☐ moderate ☐ major ☐
short-term ☐ medium term ☐ long-term ☐

Please comment on what should be done about this issue:

.....
.....

15. In your professional field, how much **discussion** is there **about language policy?**

none ☐ minor ☐ moderate ☐ major ☐

15

16. Are **conferences** in your field mostly **monolingual or multilingual?**

	monolingual		multilingual	
	Danish	English	without interpretation	with interpretation
Danish conferences	☐	☐	☐	☐
Nordic conferences	☐	☐	☐	☐
international conf.	☐	☐	☐	☐

If multilingual, in which languages?

.....

17. Are you familiar with any valuable scientific **research** which has **not been "noticed"** by the scientific community because it was reported on in Danish or another Nordic language?

.....

18. Do you feel the obligation to write in E/F/G has **influenced your scientific approach and values?** How?

.....

.....

.....

.....

19. Any **other comments**?

20. Do you want to receive a short **report on** the preliminary **results** of this study? Yes ☐ No ☐

Thank you very much.

Name:

46

EU and Danish Support for Linguistic Engineering for a Less Used Language

Bente Maegaard, Center for Sprogteknologi,
Njalsgade 80, DK-2300 Copenhagen S

Language Technology

By language technology we understand all kinds of computer programs which manipulate text or speech themselves or which help the user manipulate text or speech. This means that language technology encompasses e.g.

Authoring aids: hyphenation programs, spelling checkers, grammar checkers
Translation: tools for machine translation or translation support
Information retrieval
Automatic abstracting
Spoken dialogue
Dictation systems
Education and training programs.

Authoring aids

Hyphenation exists for most languages as an integral part of text processors - and working more or less well! Spelling checkers are also a standard part of text processing these days. But when it comes to grammar checkers, we see that they only exist for some languages, and in a European context, we should in particular mention that they do not exist for all European Union languages. There is no Danish grammar checker. The reason for that is that with a population of only 5 million, the Danish market is not big enough to fund the development of a grammar checker.

Translation

Some, but very few translation programs exist which have Danish as one of the languages. E.g. it is interesting to note that the machine translation system SYSTRAN which was purchased by the European Commission in 1976 to support their Translation Service was never developed to treat Danish, whereas it *was* developed for all the rest of the, until recently, 9 languages. Translation support is one of the language support tools which are most needed for less used languages. This is true for translation out of the less used language and for translation into it.

Dictation systems

The next item I want to comment on is the existence or non-existence of dictation systems. Dictation systems are systems which take spoken input to a text processor and render it in a written from. They are produced by two or three major providers and they appear in several languages, but again not in Danish. I have talked to several people in the IBM organisation about the possibility of having a Danish version of IBM's Voice Type, but from everybody I get the same answer: they do not think it is economically viable for the time being.

Purpose of language technology

One could ask: What do we need language technology for? Humans are very good at using natural language, why not let humans do it. The answer to this is that language technology is used to *make communication more efficient*, by supporting humans in their work with the language. Spelling checkers may help the user who is not a strong speller, but in particular they speed up the proof-reading process. Translation tools help the human translator to translate bigger volumes of text and to achieve accuracy in the translation of terms, but it may also help the user who does not understand a particular language to get some idea about what is in a document. So even imperfect translation tools may be valuable by giving some access to information expressed in otherwise inaccessible languages.

Language technology is a sine qua non in modern business administration; it supports the document production in the original version, as well as its translation to other languages. This means that a language for which no tools exist cannot be used for serious purposes, business, technology and science. This perspective is a serious one for a less used language. Only good tools can protect our language and prevent the language users in business and technical and scientific matters from changing into, e.g., English.

If technical articles are not written in Danish, then the vocabulary and technical terminology will not be created for new fields, and in a while the language can no longer be used for this type of communication. We have seen this happen to some extent in the technical fields, and we should all do our best to prevent such an impoverishment from happening. This can be done in two ways. First of all, the language users should be aware of their responsibility to keep the technical and business language alive. Secondly, and this is the important part without which the first one does not work, we have to make sure that language technology tools are developed for our language.

As we have seen, we cannot rely on market forces to provide language technology tools for the less used languages. Public support is necessary.

EU support for language technology

During the 2nd Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development, the EUROTRA programme was adopted by the Council of Ministers (1982). EUROTRA was a machine translation project for all Community languages, i.e. 6 when the proposal was made, 7 in 1982 when the decision was taken and 9 in 1986. This was a huge research project with teams in all the Community countries. It lasted until 1992. At this point, a prototype of a multilingual MT system had been developed. This is one of the big investments by the EU into language technology. Apart from the prototype it led to an awareness of language technology, and it trained hundreds of people in the field.

One of the effects of the EUROTRA programme was that the community at large became aware of language technology. This led to the inclusion of language Research and Engineering (LRE) in the 3rd Framework Programme (cf. the Danzin-report, 1994) and later to the inclusion of Language Engineering in the 4th Framework Programme. We expect that Language Engineering will be in the 5th Framework Programme as well.

Danish support for language technology

Danish public support for computational linguistics and language technology has several sources. First of all, most universities have departments of computational linguistics, providing both research and education. Secondly, there have been various initiatives under the Research Councils for Humanities and for the Technical Sciences: the Research Council for the Humanities has had a special focus on computational linguistics in their strategy plans several times during the last 10 years. Similarly, the Research Council for the Technical Sciences and the Research Council for the Natural Sciences have supported speech technology, i.e. speech recognition as well as speech synthesis. The Research Council for the Technical Sciences has created a temporary centre, the Centre for Person Communication at Aalborg University for 5 years, and the Ministry of Research created our Centre, Center for Sprogteknologi, Centre for Language Technology for 5 years in 1991. The Centre is now permanent.

As can be seen, the Danish national funding agencies have seen the need and given support to the field. However, this type of support will have to continue in order for the actors in the field to provide the input

for the production of the language technology tools mentioned above.

Results and implications

EUROTRA had an equal treatment of all languages. This meant that the same amount of manpower was set aside for the development of the prototype elements, grammar, dictionary, translation rules, for each language. When it came to the financial arrangements, there was a principle of cohesion even before this phenomenon was invented: the cost for each language was the same, but it was not all countries that were able to cover the expenses. Consequently, the smaller countries had a larger proportion of their expenses covered by the Commission, e.g. Denmark had 80% covered.

The result of EUROTRA was to put DK on the international map of machine translation. In particular after Center for Sprogteknologi built the PaTrans MT system, using EUROTRA technology. Denmark was the first and until now the only country to use EUROTRA for practical purposes. PaTrans translates patent texts from English to Danish.

In the follow-up programmes under FP 3 and FP 4, Danish participants are merely entitled to rouhghly Denmark's "share" - 2% of the resources available. Denmark may sometimes obtain slightly more than 2%, but not enough to really support our language. A less used language needs *more* support than the average, and in the current scheme gets *far less*!

The results and implications of the Danish initiatives are that Danish human resources are trained and supported, Danish researchers are given good possibilities to develop their capabilities. Secondly, that basic knowledge and some linguistic resources for language technology are created. Basic research in the Danish language can normally be funded only by national sources, and some of the development of linguistic resources for language technology also has to be paid from national sources.

Conclusion

Language technology is extremely important for Denmark and for the Danish language, but Denmark does not have the necessary resources, so substantial support from the EU is necessary. In the case of less used languages, it would be fair to use the cohesion principle to give more support for these languages than for the average EU language, instead of the opposite.

Literature:

Danzin, A: *Towards a European Linguistic Infrastructure*, European Commission, Luxembourg 1994.

Danish Perceptions of the Need for Language Policies in the Business Community

Annelise Grinsted, Southern Denmark Business School

It is important to view language as part of the communication process that takes place in enterprises, both the native language and the foreign languages necessary to achieve the goals of the business community.

Lack of communication is often blamed for things going wrong in a company, but when trying to improve communication the company focuses on media and channels such as telephones, especially mobile phones, online communication like teamoffice systems with fax and e-mail facilities, video conferencing, World Wide Web, etc. Seldom is the focus on what is being communicated and less on the process.

Depending on the size of the enterprise and the degree of internationalization, there may be a need for an increased use of foreign languages for the following reasons:

- a need to operate on an international level due to a limited home market.
- a need for openness and cooperation in order to be able to stay ahead due to the continuous and rapid technological development and thus the increased complexity and high costs of many products.
- direct investmensts in companies across national borders by foreign nationals due to the necessity for enterprises to grow bigger and more international in order to survive in global competition.
- a strong commitment to the European market through membership of the European Union

This results in an increased need for foreign languagues and thus the introduction of

- a corporate language, defined "as the language used to communicate across national borders between mother company and subsidiaries and among subsidiaries".
- and of several usable foreign languages in order to communicate with various types of communication partners with different backgrounds such as authorities, agents, distributors, suppliers and customers. This is necessary to keep up with markets, customers, competitors, legislation, products and political climate.

The globalization process has ramifications in the economic sphere where products are to flow from one country to the other without barriers. Thus the requirements to, e.g. product documentation both in one´s own country and across borders will become stricter. In some cases this is to safeguard the end-consumer in the form of informative labels on foodstuffs and directions for use of various devices. But to an increasing degree it is also to protect the industrial customer from losses in the form of time, money, industrial injury, false claims, etc. by demanding product liability of the seller. The Americans have been leading in this area and are setting a general trend for the rest of the world. An example of this in Denmark is "Bekendtgørelse om indretning af tekniske hjælpemidler", which comprises machines, containers, apparatus, tools and similar devices which requires clear guidelines for documentation of products to be sold in foreign countries. This states that:

> "...der til hver maskine skal følge en brugsanvisning, som mindst omfatter oplysninger om: igangsætning, anvendelse, håndtering, vægt og dens forskellige dele, montering og demontering, indstilling, vedligeholdelse og evt. fornøden oplæring". Dette skal leveres på følgende måde "Fabrikanten eller hans i fællesskabet etablerede repræsentant udarbejder brugsanvisningen på et af de officielle fællesskabssprog. Når maskinen tages i brug, skal den ledsages af en oversættelse af brugsanvisningen til anvendelseslandets sprog samt af den oprindelige brugsanvisning".

The Danish statutory instrument is a consequence of decisions made in the EU.

As the world in which we live changes and becomes more international, physical borders and distances become less important and are no longer barriers. These changes, however, increase the need for securing communication acrosss borders.

A step towards ensuring the communication in the business community is to establish language policies that regulate the communication process. A "language policy" is a decision concerning the resource area language which can guide employees, that is, the framework within which employees can work. A language

policy need not be written down to be valid or known. However, in order for a policy to serve its purpose all employees must be familiar with it which requires careful consideration of media and channels. It may include guidelines for the following areas:

- which language is to be used as corporate language;
- which documents are available at any given time in which language;
- which markets require language skills;
- which employees are to speak which languages;
- at which competence level is each employee to speak;
- quality level;
- language quality differentiation;
- procedures to secure language and communication quality;
- resources allocated to the language domain;
- how to use the linguistic resources at an optimum.

In the following I will differentiate between small and medium-sized companies, so-called SMEs, and large companies when dealing with how companies handle communication across borders.

The information on SMEs is based on the results of an EU-survey, "Foreign Languages Analysis in Industrial Regions of Europe", in which 297 SMEs in Denmark or 31% out of 971 returned a questionnaire.

Generally, small companies with only few employees do not employ a language specialist as often there would not be sufficient language work to warrant such a position. The foreign language communication is taken care of by managers or sales and marketing personnel with other educational backgrounds. This is related to two factors: 1) the nature of the export activity as these companies have often started on the home market and grown into international relations and 2) the lack of resources to tackle these types of problems.

To the question whether the company had a plan for language training only 7.7% answered positively. However, in job ads 54.2% had required language qualifications for sales and administrative personnel in English and German.

About SMEs the following can be said:

- foreign language proficiency has low priority in the companies when compared with other competence areas important for the primary aim of the company - to sell the product(s) in question;

- the companies still consider foreign language proficiency an innate ability. All children learn at least two foreign languages in primary school: English and German. The attitude towards upgrading these skills does not change until distinct language and cultural problems appear in foreign markets;

- the lack of a language training strategy makes the choice of foreign markets haphazard (e.g. an employee with special language skills is able to establish contacts);

- to compensate for lack of language competence, companies develop their own strategies which could be called "avoidance strategies". These so-called strategies defer the decision to tackle language problems in a strategic way:

  - SMEs limit their exports to countries in the vicinity, e.g. the Scandinavian countries where they can manage in Interscandinavian, or Germany where they can speak a familiar language although other markets may present great export potentials;

  - SMES develop a network of agents who speak the necessary foreign languages although a direct contact may present advantages;

  - SMEs avoid direct contact by faxing to gain time to decipher the written foreign language communication although most are aware that direct contact by telephone is becoming an increasingly important means of communication;

  - SMEs use external assistance from both professional and non-professional translators although each

new link in the communication chain may contain risks of misunderstandings;

- SMEs close their eyes completely to possible language problems, and employees are allowed to speak as best they can in any foreign language necessary to communicate;

The larger the company, the more specific is the awareness about the importance of languages as a means of communication. The information about large companies is based on an in depth investigation of a large company with approx. 800 employees in 1995 and my experience and cooperation with several others over the past 10 years.

The specific investigation took place in two phases: 1) as a questionnaire survey and 2) through interviews with selected employees.

Two questionnaires were worked out: one for language specialists (20 in all) and the other for non-language specialists including department heads, employees who supply the language specialists with language work and members of the Board of Directors (48 in all). Of the 68 questionnaires, 57 were returned and 45 were selected for interviews.

A company competes with other companies to make a profit, expand and survive. Language becomes a competition parameter because customers ask directly in which languages the company can operate. For example, is it a necessity to be able to negotiate, maintain relations and in the end to deliver documentation in the language required by the customer. Thus, language qualifications are one among many factors on which the company is evaluated. At the same time, language is an image parameter as it is difficult to maintain trust in a partner that cannot express thoughts, ideas and facts in a comprehensible way, whether in writing or face-to-face.

Due to this awareness, the company requires knowledge of foreign languages in order to operate in international markets. This manifests itself in two ways:

1) When the company advertises for new employees, language qualifications are a prerequesite. This is, of course, obvious when employing language specialists. But 72% of the suppliers indicated that this was stipulated in the job advertisement they reflected on. 87% indicated that they were asked directly about these qualifications during their job interview and 25% that they were in some way tested although it was not a formal test.

2) All categories of employees are offered language courses. During the past 2 years, 46% of the non-language specialists had attended language courses, primarily in German and English. The language specialists attend language courses, too - often courses within specific areas in which they feel a need for upgrading - e.g. areas such as legal language and accounting terminology.

However, the importance of languages is not specifically reflected in a company policy. During the interviews, many of the interviewees stated that they had seen some text that resembled a language policy. Based on this, company contacts were pressed for some sort of document and an extract of the minutes of a board meeting that dealt with the subject of language work was presented:

1) Based on some unfortunate examples it is necessary **to stress responsiblity for quality** in this area both on the language specialists (have to answer for the quality) and suppliers (have to provide reasonable work conditions).

2) It is necessary to strengthen cross organizational cooperation - also ERFA cooperation (exchange of experience) in order to:

   - maintain standards and guidelines for language work (avoid anarchy and maintain our image externally);
   - optimum use of tools (maximum rationalization advantages on large investments);
   - supplementary training of language specialists (development of competence also in the language area).

This is a statement from the Board of Directors distributed to department heads for further action and reflects that the company has been faced with language problems. When board members were asked more closely about language policy, the answer was that the company has no tradition for formulating rules and regulations

of any sort, but that policies are communicated more informally to employees in line with company culture in general.

There is no doubt that the company is quality-oriented and that quality in language work is of importance. However, one interviewee expressed his view in the following way: "The company objective is to make money. However, the function of language specialists is to secure that communication is unambiguous, precise and efficient. Quality must be high and communication must be efficient. There is an inherent paradox in this in that the two objectives may be in conflict with one another".

The paradox results in a certain measure of inefficiency and conflict. Currently, there is frustration among language specialists about their working conditions. The most important are the following:

- lack of understanding of the translation process. Many of the suppliers consider translation to be a mechanical process of substituting one word in the source language for another in the target language. This is by some interpreted as a lack of respect of the complexity of language work in general.
- competence conflicts of various sorts with suppliers. For example, criticism by the supplier of the result of a translation without having considered the quality of the source text, or suppliers overrate their own language competence and therefore feel free to make all kinds of corrections in translations made by language specialists.
- the quality of the source texts. The language specialists struggle with various problems in the source texts: lack of cohesiveness (88%), jargon (77%), grammatical problems (65%) and terminological problems (65%). This is a delaying factor in a pressured work process but is also considered a professional challenge.
- the all-pervasive time pressure. Practically every single language specialist mentioned that they hardly ever had time to do the work satisfactorily. One interviewee expressed it in this way: "Never being able to do a thorough job makes you lose interest". There was a certain understanding that the suppliers themselves ran into many delays, but nonetheless the final deadline was always to be met by the language specialist.

The language specialists were in no doubt that the standard of the language work and thus of the communication could have consequences for the volume of business - positive and negative.

Among the suppliers, there was frustration concerning the language process. As practically any document leaving the company has to undergo some language process, it becomes a bottleneck. According to them the language specialists become a bottleneck for two reasons: 1) there are not sufficient language specialists and 2) they always want a high level of quality. Therefore, documents drafted by the suppliers themselves increasingly left the company without having been through any sort of revision.

If the strategies of the SMEs and large companies are compared it could be said that there are differences in:

- the priority of language qualifications;
- language training offered to employees;
- language skills in the company;
- market and export strategies;
- range of markets;
- ways of communicating;
- employment of language specialists.

However, a language policy as such is seldom found in a company. Vague guidelines may be available -often the consequence of a critical situation or problem and hardly ever a strategic consideration. This means that the possible contents of a language policy mentioned earlier in the case of SMEs are not even a consideration, whereas in the case of large companies a certain awareness exists but does not result in a policy or a similar instrument. The consequences of the lack of specific guidelines are that language and communication problems are not tackled systematically and leaves frustration and uncertainty among the employees.

References:

Grinsted, Annelise (1993). *Foreign Language Analysis in Industrial Regions of Europe - Denmark*, Det erhverssproglige Forskningsinstitut, skriftserie 07.1993, Handelshøjskole Syd (31 pages + annexes)

Grinsted, Annelise (1993). Data Collection Methods + Southern Denmark, in: Hagen, Stephen (ed.) *Languages in European Business, A Regional Survey of Small & Medium-sized Companies*, Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research, London, p. 30-36 + p. 48-58

Grinsted, Annelise (1994). *Interview Follow-up on the 'Foreign Language Analysis in Industrial Regions of Europe' Questionnaire Survey - Denmark*, Institut for Erhvervssprog, skriftserie 10.1994, Handelshøjskole Syd (81 pages)

Grinsted, Annelise & Anne Møller (1995). *Statusrapport vedrørende sprogarbejdet på XXX* (not published)

Grinsted, Annelise (1996). The Role of Languages - a triangular conflict of interests? in: *Proceedings from AFinLA Symposium*, Vaasa Universitet (not yet published)

Some points from the concluding discussion session

Bente Bakmand, Robert Phillipson & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas

It is perhaps ironic that a conference on language policy, with participants from several countries, in multilingual Europe, a conference implicitly underpinned by a commitment to linguistic diversity, should take place entirely in English. This in no way implies any acceptance of English expanding at the expense of other languages (or support for the Diffusion of English paradigm, see page 38 above). In fact the most prominent topic in the discussion phase of the language policy conference was measures for promoting multilingualism both in European Union (EU) institutions and generally.

A recent statement of EU policy on languages is the *White Paper on Education and Training*, which was referred to at the conference. The relevant section dealing with language learning is reproduced as Appendix 1. This document asserts the principle of all schoolgoers in EU countries learning three community languages, i.e. the dominant language of the state (any needs or rights for minority language speakers to learn their own languages are ignored) and two foreign languages. In addition early foreign language learning is recommended.

One participant at the conference expressed the view that the White Paper can be seen as reflecting one of two possible developments in the EU, namely a move towards greater plurilingualism. The alternative scenario involves a restriction of language rights, and is based on a widespread suspicion that the possible expansion of the EU to take in more member states will trigger a reduction in the number of languages in use as official and working languages. This would imply limiting the system of interpretation and translation currently in force in EU institutions.

Whether these two moves exclude each other or are mutually compatible is difficult to assess, as the relationship between current rights to "full" multilingualism between each official language, and specific restrictions on language choice will need analysis when any EU language policy proposals or measures are announced. The White Paper itself was seen by some participants as a positive indication that the EU is encouraging multilingualism. It may on the other hand place constraints on the freedom of individual states to devise their own language policies.

Various views and focuses on European language policy were expressed, this in part reflecting the various nationalities of the participants and the relative strength of their mother tongues. In Germany the Europeanization process is considered much more important than the promotion of the German language. This is partly a consequence of a wish to avoid earlier Nazi excesses, as can be seen in prudence following unification. In France by contrast, the promotion of French, and curbing the influence of English, are quite explicitly argued for as a way to ensure cultural and linguistic pluralism in Europe. Unlike most member states, the French have consistently insisted on the right in the EU to speak their language and have all documents translated into it.

Since Danish can hardly be regarded as an "international" language, except in inter-Nordic communication, promoting the learning of Danish as a foreign language does not seem to be a relevant issue, unlike the question of maintaining the right to interpretation and translation into and from Danish in EU institutions. At stake in relation to the *interpretation* services is the democratic right of politicians, civil servants and experts to use the language that they are best able to express themselves in. At stake in relation to *translation* services is the right of all those involved and the general public to access in each official language to any important document.

If nationality is important in many EU contexts, a relevant question to ask is how far, when plurilingualism or cultural pluralism in Europe is argued for, the nationality of whoever is pleading such a cause is significant. Is someone from France, Germany or Denmark invariably seeking to promote the "national interest" and the "national" language? If so, what consequences follow for a potential common European language policy, its scope and field of operation?

One general need that was expressed was to define the contexts where the EU should intervene or change practice in language matters, and the factors determining why and when. If the costs of language services are substantial, it is important to recall that such costs pale before the costs of many activities, the common agricultural policy in particular, and the cost of financing government services in each country. How then are the costs of language services to be related to factors that could necessitate a restriction in the number of official and working languages? Is the cost of efficient interaction that only two, possibly three, and exceptionally four languages should serve as working languages? In what ways do such policies and decisions

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

affect democratic principles and practice?

European integration and the free movement (of goods, services, labour and capital) that is the goal and means for achieving integration presuppose infrastructures for communication. Bridges, tunnels, motorways and superhighways on computer nets are the material/physical infrastructures that permit movement and communication, while languages are the non-material prerequisites for communication and mobility. As compared with the costs of bridges, the costs involved in language learning and translation are minor and environment-friendly. These differences should be borne in mind when "costs" are assessed.

A few more general topics were touched on, among them the need for further research, and access to a share of EU funds for work in various areas of language policy. Several participants expressed a wish to promote a broader understanding of language awareness, not least among foreign language teachers. This led to a discussion of how and why to promote plurilinguistic awareness within foreign language teaching, what types of awareness to promote, and how this awareness could be harnessed to promoting receptive competence in several related languages.

There seemed, in conclusion, to be agreement that there is a need for language policy, and the various domains and levels it is concerned with, to be made more explicit, and a need for defining, theorizing and synthesizing language policy more precisely than is the case today. Most participants seemed to agree that while there is a definite need for dialogue with politicians, the state of the art probably means that any steps towards making language policy more visible nationally and supranationally need to be extremely carefully prepared. More research is needed, and clear presentation of the issues in forms that are comprehensible to a wide audience.

Appendix
From the *White Paper on Education and Training*

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 29.11.1995
COM(95) 590 final

WHITE PAPER ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING

TEACHING AND LEARNING

* * *

TOWARDS THE LEARNING SOCIETY

5 o

IV. Fourth general objective

"PROFICIENCY IN THREE COMMUNITY LANGUAGES"

Proficiency in several Community languages has become a precondition if citizens of the European Union are to benefit from the occupational and personal opportunities open to them in the border-free Single Market. This language proficiency must be backed up by the ability to adapt to working and living environments characterised by different cultures.

Languages are also the key to knowing other people. Proficiency in languages helps to build up the feeling of being European with all its cultural wealth and diversity and of understanding between the citizens of Europe.

Learning languages also has another important effect: experience shows that when undertaken from a very early age, it is an important factor in doing well at school. Contact with another language is not only compatible with becoming proficient in one's mother tongue, it also makes it easier. It opens the mind, stimulates intellectual agility and, of course, expands people's cultural horizon. Multilingualism is part and parcel of both European identity/citizenship and the learning society.

The European Union, for its part, is contributing to the development of language learning as part of LINGUA, now integrated in the SOCRATES and LEONARDO programmes.

It is no longer possible to reserve proficiency in foreign languages for an elite or for those who acquire it on account of their geographical mobility. In line with the resolution of the Council of Education Ministers of 31 March 1995, it is becoming necessary for everyone, irrespective of training and education routes chosen, to be able to acquire and keep up their ability to communicate in at least two Community languages in addition to their mother tongue. The Commission regrets the fact that the importance of this commitment was reduced, the Member States limiting its effect by using the words "if possible".

In order to make for proficiency in three Community languages, it is desirable for foreign language learning to start at pre-school level. It seems essential for such teaching to be placed on a systematic footing in primary education, with the learning of a second Community foreign language starting in secondary school. It could even be argued that secondary school pupils should study certain subjects in the first foreign language learned, as is the case in the European schools. Upon completing initial training everyone should be proficient in two Community foreign languages.

Vocational training - initial and continuing - must place great stress on language learning. This is of dual significance for working life because it constitutes a major element in a person's general cultural development and is an advantage when it comes to obtaining a job, either inside one's home country or when taking up the option of mobility available within the Union.

All this presupposes the availability of top-quality education drawing on modern materials, equipment and methods customised to meet the needs of the diverse groups involved.

In keeping with this, the White Paper proposes the following support measures at European level:

- Community support for the introduction of assessment systems (including elaboration of quality indicators) and quality guarantee systems, covering the methods and materials used to teach Community languages.

- Definition of a **"European quality label"** and its award to schools meeting certain criteria regarding promotion of Community language learning (see box).

- Support for exchanges of language-teaching materials suitable for different groups (adults, the low-qualified, young children, etc.).

- Encouraging the early teaching of Community languages, notably through the exchange of teaching materials and experience in this area.

60

Example N°4

"European quality label"

Aims

- Promote the learning of at least two Community foreign languages by all young people.
- Encourage innovatory language-teaching methods.
- Spread the daily use of European foreign languages in schools of all levels.
- Foster awareness of Community languages and cultures, and their early learning.

Methods

- Mobilising schools to provide learning of at least one Community foreign language as early as primary school.
- Define a "European quality label" quality label which would be awarded according to the following criteria:
  - genuine use by all pupils of one Community foreign language at primary school and of two at secondary school.
  - involvement of teaching staff from other EU Member States.
  - use of methods promoting self-learning of languages.
  - creation of an organisation for contact between young people from different Member States (including via information technologies).

  Promotion of this label will make it possible to assemble additional funding from the Member States (including local authorities).
- Networking establishments having obtained this label.
- Systematically encouraging mobility to allow teachers to teach their mother tongue in schools in another country, as permitted by Community law and the ensuing changes made in civil service structures.

1974

* 1. Utz Maas, Sprachtheorie
* 2. Per Aage Brandt, Om sprogets samfundsmæssighed
* 3. Lis Glebe-Møller, Ansatser til et opgør med den behavioristiske sprogundervisning

1975

* 4. Peter Harms Larsen, Papirer til «Samtalens grammatik»
* 5. Lis-Glebe-Møller, Hvilken slags fransk skal der undervises i i vore skoler?
Henning Silberbrandt, Fremmedsprogsindlæring og fagstruktur

1976

* 6. Frans Gregersen m.fl., Revideret udgave af introduktionen og kapitelindledningerne til antologien «Klassesprog»
* 7. Ulf Teleman, How to become concrete in linguistics

1977

* 8. Ulf Teleman, (1) On causal conjunctions in Swedish, (2) Språk och socialisiation, Reflexioner över reflexioner, (3) Grammatikens tillstånd och behov
* 9. Hartmut Haberland, Review of Bente Maegaard m.fl., Matematik og lingvistik
* 10. Andrew Tolson, Approaches to language in cultural studies
Ulrich Ammon, Probleme soziolinguistischer Theoriebildung am Beispiel von Dialekt und Einheitssprache

1978

* 11. Ulf Teleman, Språkrigtighet i och utanför skolan
* 12. Norbert Dittmar, Hartmut Haberland, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Ulf Teleman, eds, Papers from the first Scandinavian-German symposium on the language of immigrant workers and their children, Roskilde 19–23 March 1978
* 13. Peter Harms Larsen, Tekst og tale – analyser og problemer
* 14. Niels Haastrup og Ulf Teleman, Svensk, dansk eller skandinavisk? En interview-undersøgelse af svenske læreres sproglige situation på et dansk universitet
15. Karen Risager, red. Fremmedsprogsundervisning på RUC

1979

* 16. Karen Risager og Niels Haastrup, red. Om anvendelse af sprogvidenskabelig viden i erhvervsfunktioner uden for skolesystemet. Rapport fra den 4. konference i nydansk grammatik og sprogbeskrivelse
* 17. Hartmut Haberland and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Political determinants of pragmatic and sociolinguistic choices

1980

* 18. Hverdagsskrift i anledning af ROLIGS femårsjubilæum
* 19. Elisabeth Bense, Linguistische Theorie und Sprachunterricht
Hartmut Haberland, Status und Legitimation von Theorien der Sprachvariation
20. Jørgen U. Sand og Søren Kolstrup, «Il fait rien? Je crois pas que je le dirais.»
* 21. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, (1) Guest worker or immigrant — different ways of reproducing an underclass, (2) Violence as method and outcome in the non-education of minority children

1981

22. Karen Sonne Jakobsen, (1) Gruppeorganiseret og selvstyret fremmedsprogstilegnelse. Et undervisningseksperiment på RUC. (2) Skolesprogene. Om fremmedsprogenes status og funktion i gymnasiet

* 23. Ulf Teleman, Talet och skriften

* 24. Arne Thing Mortensen, Jørgen U. Sand og Ulf Teleman, Om at læse fremmedsprogede tekster på 1. del af universitetsstudierne. 15 beskrevne og kommenterede forsøg.

* 25. Niels Haastrup, Ferie i udlandet & Færdighed i fremmedsprog. Rapportering om bearbejdelse af to statistiske undersøgelser

* 26. Karen Risager og Ulf Teleman, red. Kønsspecifik sprogbrug — hvad er det?

1983

* 27. Niels Haastrup, Tre debatoplæg om sprogpolitik og sprogundervisning i Danmark

* 28. Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Cultilingualism - Papers in cultural and communicative (in)competence

* 29. Knud Anker Jensen, Kontrastiv hverdag. Et alternativt "Landeskunde"-seminar
Niels Haastrup, Fremmedsprog i det sprogsociologiske billede i Danmark

1984

30. Jochen Rehbein, Reparative Handlungsmuster und ihre Verwendung im Fremdsprachenunterricht

* 31. Hartmut Haberland og Jacob L. Mey, Godt Peer Gynt er halve verket
Hartmut Haberland, A field manual for readers of "The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages" by Bronislaw Malinowski

* 32. Annette Bennicke, «Dieu a créé la femelle, l'homme a fait la femme.» En rekognoscering i dansk og udenlandsk kønssprogsforskning

* 33. Lars Heltoft og Uwe Geist, Relevans og intention. To analyser af en massemedietekst om økonomisk politik

* 34. Niels Haastrup, Uddrag af Christian Jensen Fauerbyes papirer samt bilag. Handout fra Själö-symposiet, september 1984

1985

* 35. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson, Educational strategies in multicultural contexts

36. Senta Trömel-Plötz, Women's conversational culture: Rupturing patriarchal discourse

37. Rainer Paris, Zur symbolischen Konstruktion politischer Feindbilder

* 38. Karen Sonne Jakobsen, red. Projektarbejde i fremmedsprogene. Rapport fra seminar på Roskilde Universitetscenter, 30.11.-1.12.1985

1986

39. Lars Heltoft, Verb-second-analysen - et svar fra Diderichsen-traditionen

40. Lars Heltoft, The pragmatic syntax of Danish *der*-constructions

1987

* 41. Karen Risager, Cultural studies and foreign language teaching in Denmark

1988

42. Robert Phillipson and Karen Sonne Jakobsen, eds., Student foreign language projects at RUC

* 43. Elisabeth Bense, Tyskland - et gråt land med et grimt sprog, oder: Die Haltung dänischer Gymnasiasten zu Deutsch, Deutschland und den Deutschen

1989

44. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Robert Phillipson, Wanted! Linguistic human rights
* 45. Karen Risager, Kulturformidlingen i fremmedsprogsundervisningen: 4 artikler

1990

* 46. Carol Henriksen, Two papers on 'fag(sprog)lig kommunikation'

1991

* 47. Jytte Becker, Samtaler i hvid kittel. En analyse af indlæggelsessamtaler og deres institutionelle betingelser
* 48. Hans-Georg Grüning, Minderheiten und Minderheitenliteratur — Beispiel: Südtirol
Mart Rannut, Beyond language policy: The Soviet Union versus Estonia

1992

* 49. Thorstein Fretheim, Grammatically underdetermined Theme-Rheme articulation

1993

50. Bent Preisler, Attitudes, norms and standardization in English: Some aspects of the language in its social context
Claudia Caffi, Metapragmatics and Chauncey Gardener: Toward an ecology of communication
51. Jens Høyrup, Sumerian: the descendant of a proto-historical creole? An alternative approach to the »Sumerian problem«

1994

* 52. Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, eds. Papers from the Round Table on Language Policy in Europe, Roskilde, April 22, 1994

1995

53. Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Papers in European language policy
54. Lars Heltoft and Lisbeth Falster Jakobsen, Danish passives and subject positions as a mood system – a content analysis
Lars Heltoft, Paradigmatic structure, word order and grammaticalization

1996

55. Bent Preisler, red. Tre indlæg om *Interlanguage Pragmatics*
56. Bente Bakmand, Robert Phillipson and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, eds. Papers in language policy. Papers from the Language Policy Conference, Roskilde, January 29, 1996

* = udsolgt/out of print